Christianity and Society

The Common Convictions of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians

by A. T. Mollegen

British Criticisms of These Convictions

Introduced by Ronald Preston

The Work of a Chaplain

by Richard W. Day

Christian Foundations of the Peace

by Paul Lehmann

SPRING 1944 **25 CENTS**

Volume 9 Spring 1944 Number 2

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIETY

A Quarterly devoted to Christianity and Social Reconstruction
PUBLISHED BY THE FELLOWSHIP OF SOCIALIST CHRISTIANS

The Annual Fellowship Meeting

The annual meeting of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians will be held in New York on May 22-23, 1944. The Statement of principles which were discussed in the Winter meeting, will be reconsidered in terms of the revision of the Statement prepared by Professor Mollegen's Committee. We are publishing this Statement in this issue of our journal because we believe that it has significance not only for the inner circle of the Fellowship, but for the readers of "Christianity and Society". We are also publishing comments on the Statement by British friends, who represent similar thought in Great Britain.

The annual meeting will consider one other basic topic: The problem of an individualistic Protestantism confronting a collectivist age. Our thought on this subject will be led by Professor Paul Tillich and Rev. Jesse Trotter, Chaplain of Amherst College.

EDITOR
REINHOLD NIEBUHR

EDITORIAL BOARD
EDUARD HEIMANN CLIFFORD STANLEY RICHARD DAY A. T. MOLLEGEN
WINNIFRED WYGAL HARRY BONE ROSE TERLIN ARNOLD NASH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FELLOWSHIP OF SOCIALIST CHRISTIANS
NORMAN SIBLEY EDUARD HEIMANN RICHARD DAY WINNIFRED WYGAL
JOHN CARTMELL REINHOLD NIEBUHR HERBERT KING RALPH READ
JOHN DANIEL B. APELIAN CHARLES KEAN
PAUL STREICH—TREASURER

Subscription Rate: $1.00 per year; 25c per copy
4 Shillings per year in England
Published Quarterly

Mrs. Nola Meade, Secretary, 3041 Broadway, N. Y. C.
English Agent: Ronald Preston, Annandale, North End Road, London N. W. 11.
Australian Agent: Rev. H. P. Reynolds, West Goulburn Rectory, 142 Coromandel St., Goulburn, N. S. W., Australia.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIETY

Volume 9 Number 2

EDITORIALS

The Presidential Election and American Politics

The Presidential election offers some interesting lights and sidelights on the whole confusion of the political scene in America and on the problems which face us in the future.

It is now quite apparent that Mr. Roosevelt will run again, though probably this decision will be against his inclination and will be forced upon him by his party, which knows that it has no other candidate who has the slightest hope of victory. Among those who will ask him to run are the southern reactionaries who have fought him bitterly, particularly in the past four years. They have fought him not only because the administration has been more liberal economically than the southern landlords who control the democratic party, chiefly by disfranchising both negroes and poor whites through the poll tax; but also because the Roosevelt administration has helped the negroes more than any previous administration, either Republican or Democratic. That democratic administration, which has its foundations in a southern party, preoccupied with the one issue of "white supremacy" should have been able to do so much for the negro is one measure of Roosevelt's achievements. Paradoxically it will not prevent him from losing most of the negro votes, won in the last two elections, in the coming one. The northern negroes are leaving the president's party because southern pressure forced him to retreat on many of the advances the administration had taken.

The reactionary side of the President's party will thus support him reluctantly and give him no support after the election. But this does not mean that the liberal side of the party, the farmers and the workers, will support him fervently. They will be equally reluctant in their support. In the case of the farmers, the support may not be forthcoming at all. The farmers erroneously hold Roosevelt responsible for rationing; and the big farm bureaus will oppose him because he prevented the inflation which their policy on food subsidies would have brought about. The farmers will give reluctant support or no support at all for reasons which are a credit to the president. The workers, on the other hand, will also give the President reluctant support, but for better reasons. They resent the continual retreat of the administration before the power of big business; never more evident, incidentally than in the acceptance of the Barush report which provides that fifteen billion dollars worth of the public stake in the war industry shall be sold under the hammer, which means, sold for a song. They also resent the effort of the administration to fit wage levels and prevent inflation. This attitude of labor is no more justified than the farmer's opposition to food subsidies. That the administration should have been able to wage a fairly successful

battle against inflation while every interest group in the nation sought its own advantage, is another one of its great achievements.

The workers nevertheless have the best case against the President because he has essentially destroyed the "New Deal" in the alleged interest of winning the war. Yet labor will vote for the president, because the Republicans will not be able to offer a candidate who would represent a decent alternative from the standpoint of the toiling masses. If Willkie were the candidate, the AFL would most probably switch to the Republican candidate and leave only the CIO on Mr. Roosevelt's side. But there is no indication that the Republicans will be wise enough to nominate Mr. Willkie. They might do it if they regarded their cause as a little more desperate. But they have scented victory and therefore think they can win with any candidate. The candidate is most likely to be Mr. Dewey, who has promised not to run. This promise makes it possible for him to secure the nomination without making any commitments.

The Republican assurance of victory will probably be the cause of Mr. Roosevelt's triumph, despite the reluctance of practically all of his supporters. Mr. Roosevelt might defeat even Mr. Willkie and is almost certain to defeat any other Republican candidate. If the army does not vote he may even be defeated; but the indications are that he will barely squeeze through.

We have not mentioned one of the primary assets of Mr. Roosevelt. The American people are quite conscious of the fact that he symbolizes America's will to resist tyranny to the outside world and that his defeat would be misinterpreted among our allies. They are afraid of that misinterpretation. Furthermore there is an actual peril in the election of some Republican candidates. If the Nazis are not defeated before November there are conceivable Republican administrations who might entertain the desperate bids for a negotiated peace which might in that event be made.

Mr. Roosevelt symbolizes not only our nation's will to resist tyranny but also our sense of continuing responsibility for the peace and order of the world community. With the exception of Mr. Willkie, no Republican candidate can be counted upon completely to save us from the mood of isolationism. It must be added that Mr. Roosevelt symbolizes the "internationalist" sentiment of the nation better than he expresses it. For the foreign policy of the administration has become so ambiguous that we can no longer be certain of its effective leadership in creating any genuine instruments of mutual security. Yet weak as it is, the administration policy is still better than most of the alternatives offered.

Thus Mr. Roosevelt will be probably nominated and elected. But if we analyse the complexion of his reluctant supporters: "white supremacy" democrats, farmers, workers and "internationalists" and the reasons for the tepid character of their support, we have cause to expect a creative fourth term. It will be a very tired and disintegrated political movement which will assume responsibility for the government of the country in the final phases of the war and the first years of reconstruction.

* *

The Perspective of Faith upon History.

It is difficult to see the meaning or trace the total outline of a great catastrophe or crisis in which we are involved. This requires a perspective which we do not have. So we live through a crisis,

preoccupied with the news of this victory and that defeat; our attention riveted upon this heroic exploit and that tragic frustration on the field of battle and upon the successes and failures of the higher strategy of the statesman as they seek to maintain unity in the counsels of a vast number of nations, only partly unified by the fear of a common peril and the desire of a common victory. Some of our attention is absorbed in speculations about the possible end of the struggle, speculations which prompt us to make careful or careless estimates of the strength of the foe and probable limit of his endurance.

These thoughts and preoccupations are inevitable consequences of a deep involvement in the struggle. A higher perspective upon the conflict is partly beyond us because we lack a focus upon the realities which only a proper distance from it can supply. The future historian will seek to comprehend the meaning of the struggle in larger outline and will trace its total dimension, as we can not. Furthermore he will have the advantage of knowing its outcome in both military and moral terms, while the future is obscure to us. It is one of the characteristics of human finiteness and human greatness, that we are so ignorant in the face of the future and so wise after the event.

Yet there is a focus upon a great event in which we are involved which depends not upon distance but upon a proper presupposition of analysis, not upon quantitative but qualitative perspective, not upon time but upon an adequate faith.

The perspective of faith does not give us God's view of the event. It gives us the consciousness of the existence of a higher view than our own. According to the Christian faith the eternal perspective upon history does not reduce the conflicts of history to meaningless struggles which are all swallowed in eternity; because we believe in a God who is involved in history, finally bearing its sorrows and taking its guilt upon Himself. On the other hand the eternal perspective does suggest a different dimension of the struggle than the one of which we are immediately conscious in our direct involvement.

If we have faith in a God before whom the nations of the earth are as a drop in the bucket and the judges of the earth are vanity, we do not rise by that faith to the eminence of God in viewing the tragic realities of our day. Yet we do, by a grace which transcends our one wisdom, see the struggle in different proportions than those which our immediate experience reveals. In our immediate experience we are a righteous nation, or an alliance of righteous nations, fighting a very great evil. The legitimacy of such judgments, prompted by immediate experience, are not annulled, but they are qualified, by the perspective of faith. According to the perspective of faith all the nations, righteous and unrighteous, victors and vanquished stand under a divine judgment.

By that higher perspective the immediate peril of the tyranny, against which we contend, is seen in the light of the total peril in which all the nations stand. Their peril is to regard their majesty and power as ultimate and to forget the majesty and power which is over and above them. If our faith raises us too far above history we may be tempted to regard this sin of the nations as merely a perennial and perpetual guilt of history about which nothing can be done. But a Christian faith never emancipates us from the responsibilities of history. It confronts us therefore with the great

historic task of our generation of establishing some tolerable instruments of world community, which will set at least some minimal restraints upon the pride and self-sufficiency of nations, so that the world will not perish in the anarchy of nationalistic polytheism. The very fact that we live in a generation in which this kind of polytheism has become historically suicidal, while it was comparatively harmless in another age represents a discernment of Christian faith about the meaningfulness of history. The admonition: "The time of man's ignorance God winked at, but now he calleth upon all men to repent" is a characteristic contribution of the Christian faith to man's discernment of the cumulative responsibilities of history.

There is however a false view **sub specie aeternitatis** of history, to which we are always tempted and to which American Christianity is particularly prone. It is the view which identifies the knowledge and consciousness of our obligation with its fulfillment. It tempts us to believe that we need only to envisage our historic task in order to have the power to fulfill it. It thinks we will form a world community of nations merely because two great catastrophes of history have forced us to recognize the necessity of this larger community. It forgets that "there is a law in our members which wars against the law that is in our mind". It does not estimate the wide gulf which yawns between the knowledge of the right and the capacity to do it. It is exactly this gulf which makes history so tragic. If St. Paul truly defines the spiritual situation for individuals in the words: "The will indeed is present with me but how to perform that which is good, I know not", how much truer is this description of the collective behaviour of mankind.

If the historic situation is measured in the light of a Christian faith which includes the Pauline realism, and which is saved by this realism from a premature transcendence over the bitter frustrations of history, we gain some appreciation of the truly tragic character of our era. No doubt some steps will be taken toward a world community. But it is now quite apparent that the nations are not going to abridge their sovereignty sufficiently to establish a really stable world order. They may not even achieve a tentative system of mutual security and drift into policies of unilateral security. This will mean not security against war, but the security of this or that nation in the event of war. But quite obviously plans for strategic security designed for the next war help to hasten that war. We can not say that a third world war is already probable. "If hopes are dupes fears may be liars". But it is obvious that the nations of the world, particularly the great nations, are not sufficiently chastened, even by the judgments of the present catastrophe, to embark upon plans sufficiently ambitious to completely overcome our present anarchy. Whether nations, in distinction to individuals ever have the experience of "grace", which enables them to do what they ought to do against their inclinations is a question. On the whole, history does not give an affirmative answer to this question. Consequently old attitudes and customs must be tortuously annihilated by history before new forms and attitudes can emerge.

At best we may be able to attain a peace which will lay tentative foundations for a tentative peace, upon which a stronger super-structure may or may not be built in future decades. At worst we will fail and make another war, in another generation, inevitable. In any event the course of history is a more ter-

rifying process than the philosophy of this era, including Christian philosophy, comprehends.

The technical aspects of our society have actually accentuated the destructive character of historical conflict; but these conflicts have always been more terrible and the new creation, which emerged from them, has been slower to manifest itself, than is understood in modern interpretations of history.

* *

Sentimental and Shallow Religion.

A friend from Britain who has just completed a speaking tour of America from coast to coast, has come to the conclusion that the churches of America have a broader hold on the population than in Britain but that their influence upon the character and temper of the nation is more shallow and superficial than in Britain. The judgment is quite right.

There is in fact an appalling corruption of sentimentality and banity in our American Protestantism which expresses itself in such varied ways as worship services in which the minister engages in chatty intercourse with the Almighty, in sermons which spin ideal possibilities of a warless world without ever coming to grips with the sins of the human heart, in social meetings which never rise above the spirit of Rotarianism and in church conferences which hold the candle light of the obvious to the daylight of common experience. We are not now speaking of the even more serious corruptions of the Christian gospel of the kind which the political evangelism of a Winrod, or a Gerald Smith or a Frank Norris reveals. In this evangelism political reaction and corruption, hatred of the Jew and Negro and every other characteristic of proto-fascism are clothed in the sanctities of the Christian gospel.

We are speaking rather of the shallow religion which informs the church life of a good part of American Protestantism, in which neither the mercy nor the judgment of God is ever mediated to the souls of men, in which the word of God's two-edged sharpness has never searched out the secret of men's hearts; in which the monstrous social evils of our day, whether economic or racial, have never been analysed so that men would recognize their own responsibility for them; in short a religion which lacks the true substance of the Christian gospel. This modern religion is a cult of sweetness and light; but frequently even such a description is too favourable if we do not add that its sweetness is cloying and its light belongs to the order of neon light.

Recently the organ of the New York City Federation of Churches reported a meeting held under its auspices in the Grand Ball Room of the Waldorf-Astoria. (We mention the locale because the message of the meeting was no different than that of the various forms of "bootleg" religion, of cults and cures, which make the hotel ballroom their sanctuary.) In this particular meeting a popular New York preacher instructed the congregation in the art of achieving "peace". His formula was: 1) Relax your muscles; 2) Relax your mind. You can do this by travelling mentally through the evergreen mountains of some past experience; and 3) Relax your spirit by quoting the words "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee". The minister recommended this procedure particularly as a cure of sleeplessness and declared that "these techniques are available to anyone who will accept the necessary simplicity of carrying them out". If this is the Christian

gospel then Coue was one of the great apostles of the Christian faith. The peace this parson is talking about has no more to do with the "peace of God which passeth understanding" and which no one receives who has not first known the judgment of God, than the cult of any swami has to do with the Christian faith.

We are living in tragic times. Not only the future of the world but that of our own nation is dark and uncertain. If we do not find some way of mitigating the horrible prejudices and conflicts which are boiling up even under the superficial unity of war-time and which threaten to engulf our national life after the war, we will be undone.

In a time of hatred the church must preach charity; but the only effective charity is based upon humility and contrition; and there can be no contrition if the judgment of God does not cleave the soul in two and shatter man's pride and self-esteem. Our sentimental religion is totally inadequate for the tragic era in which we live. It is in fact inadequate for any age; because the problem of man, as he exists in all ages is deeper than is measured by these sentimental panaceas; and the grace of God is richer than the memory of a mountain top by which these Christian swamis beguile the restless man into sleep.

We need a reformation of the church which involves its theology, and liturgy, its preaching and its social practices. We are sinking in the morass of a sticky sentimentality, while the world is engulfed in disaster.

* *

The Communist Party and Russia.

The dissolution of the communist party in this country, and the accompanying statement in which the leadership of the party accepts the continuance of a capitalist democracy as the best method of achieving justice is an additional step in the logic which determined the dissolution of the comintern. It means that communism as a creed of international revolutionary socialism is dead. Its place has been taken by a political movement which is all things to all men, so long as all things and all men can be made to serve the cause of Russia.

For a long time the interests of Russia have been primary, and the cause of world revolution has been secondary in the propoganda of world communism. The dissolution of the party and of the international instrument of communism merely means that the last pretense that the cause of Russia is avowed in the interest of world revolution, has been given up. Now nothing is avowed but simply the cause of Russia.

Surely this is one of the most interesting religio-political developments in our century. Communism, in its pure form, was a secularized religious apocalyptic creed. The triumph of communism in Russia transferred the religious emotions, associated with this apocalyptic hope, to a particular locus. The hope that the Kingdom of God would come on earth was related to the assertion that it had come on earth and that Russia was the historical embodiment of it. Since all historical realities are morally more ambiguous than any concept of the Kingdom of God, this combination of religious hope and political affirmation has brought much confusion into the political life of the western world.

The new development will eliminate some of this confusion. The cause of Russia is now avowed without any reference to its relation to the possible crea-

tion of a classless society on earth. It must be assumed that Russian politics cut themselves loose of this revolutionary hope in order to give Stalin's policy a greater freedom in dealing with any forces, reactionary or radical, conservative or liberal, in other nations, which may seem from time to time to serve the cause of Russia best.

The political strategy which prompted the destruction of international revolutionary socialism is obvious enough. What remains a great enigma however is by what kind of logic workers and intellectuals in the western world can be expected to remain loyal to a creed which has lost all explicit relation to the social and moral hopes which originally gave this creed influence outside of Russia. Is it really possible to transmute a universalistic revolutionary creed into mere patriotism and expect this curious kind of patriotism to survive? It is bad enough to live by the principle: "my country right or wrong" when it is your country. But when "my" country is not "mine" but Russia, the new creed becomes psychologically as absurd as it is morally dangerous.

Russia is a very important force in the post-war world. We will be able to come to terms with the problem of Russia best if we eliminate the religious overtones which have confused attitudes toward her. We must not expect anything transcendently virtuous from her because she has a socialized economy; nor yet assume that she is the incarnation of some transcendent evil. The socialized economy represents some real gains; and the totalitarian political structure of Russia represents some real perils. These gains and perils must be soberly assessed. Therefore let us have done with "fellow-travelling" particularly in the church.

A POEM

Afraid, and out of place;
Mean, infinitely sly, and full of shame;
Uniquely helpless—dependent;
Essentially peculiar:
Hell might be a mirror, seen of all, reflecting self . . .
Lord God! When we have drained the acid of each lying hope;
And Thou hast exiled lies which we, with endless wit, have told our hearts;
And what we are in turned from what we loathe;
And we have learned the different ways to die—
Almighty Father! Will brokenness then reap the grace it never sowed;
Will selves then have the strength of selves whose strength is not their own;
Will pity smite the horror of my voice deciding at the last?

—R. A. Landor.

COMMON CONVICTIONS OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF SOCIALIST CHRISTIANS . . .

By A. T. MOLLEGEN

The fellowship of Socialist Christians accepts the Christian faith as the only adequate interpretation of, and guide for, human existence. Its membership not only understands Christianity to demand Christians' participation in political life but also offers the following general understanding of the crisis of Western Civilization.

I.

The crisis of our civilization, the most obvious sympton of which is World War II, is at root a religious crisis traceable to the increasing faithlessness of modern life. The loss by medieval Catholicism of the prophetic understanding of God as He who invades and ultimately determines history to which He gives a real participation in His ultimate Reign resulted in a non-historical, radically supernaturalistic and other-worldly interpretation of Christianity. This permitted an unjustified Christian sanction for the feudal order even as that order was disintegrating in itself and being destroyed by the bourgeois revolutions. The Renaissance, carried by the bourgeoisie, recovered in a distorted way propetic religion's emphasis on the meaning if history and on this-worldly justice but, in its last manifestations, revealed the disavowal of Christian faith implicit in its beginnings. Modern man was led into the illusions of self-sufficiency, progress by education and trust in the pre-established harmony of nature (especially to be relied upon in a competitive economic order). These illusions are characteristic of what may be called the religion of modernity which is itself not without covert faith and overt principles derived from the Christian tradition.

The Fellowship understands modern secularism and bourgeois civilization as a divine judgment upon medieval Catholicism and feudalism. But it also understands the present crisis to be a divine judgment upon the unfaith and social injustice of bourgeois society. We believe that it is the mission of prophetic Christianity, on the one hand, to protect the Church from either deserting responsibility for, or giving Christian sanction to, the social justice of its contemporary society; and, on the other hand, to witness continually to the relevance of the Christian faith as it discerns and interprets the meaning of the terrible fruits of unfaith which are working themselves out in modern culture. The fundamental principle, therefore, which binds the Fellowship together is theological and religious. In terms of the New Testament doctrine of the Kingdom of God, our theological outlook may be described by five statements.

(1) The Kingdom of God is God's sway not man's and is embodied in history to the fullest possible degree only where Christian worship opens society to the transformations which come when God reigns and Christian faith obeys. The Fellowship is first a Christian Fel-

lowship. Insomuch as it is Christian it has, as part of the true Church, the ultimate criterion of judgment upon its world.

(2) God claims for His Reign all human and material realities. The Kingdom of God is as relevant to man's social structures, political and economic systems and use of the resources of the earth as it is to his individual morality.

(3) God's reign always encounters daemonic* opposition in human history and sinful enmity in the individual personality. This opposition may be overcome and bound but it may not be annihilated. The warfare between the Kingdom and its enemies continues until the end of history.

The consummation of God's reign, therefore, lies beyond history yet includes history. In the New Testament, this is expressed by saying that the final coming of the Kingdom of God will miraculously transform faithful man, physical nature and human historical realities.

Insomuch as the Kingdom of God is embodied in history, it is the Kingdom of Christ and is received in faith and maintained in warfare with its enemies. To understand this is to be saved from pessimism on the one hand and from trust in progress on the other.

Insomuch as God's reign is transcendent, God judges every partial embodiment of His reign in Church and society and periodically demands a new decision for a new embodiment. To understand this is to be protected from ecclesiasticism, Utopianism and moral perfectionism.

(4) God's reign destroys, affirms and transforms all human achievement. A particular period of history is always experiencing this three-fold relationship to God, yet any one or two of the divine activities may predominate.

Insomuch as there is human rejection of God's reign in its specific demanding form for a period, the forms in which the rejection expresses itself are being destroyed.

No period of history is without some divine affirmation else it would not exist.

In every period each individual, group and social formation is asked for a transformation by God. The human response to this demand is faith expressing itself in obedience to God's specific will for the times. Overt (confessing) Christian faith and implicit faith (and there is such in every humane cause) receives and expresses divine transformation so that a new partial embodiment of the Kingdom of God appears. Acceptance of God's criticisms and willingness to be transformed by the reign of God is more important to a culture than any specific understanding of what the Reign of God demands. Without the first, every society is ultimately doomed by the crystallization of its structures. Without the second, there is still the hope that God's reign will find an approximate expression which will avert disintegration or destruction. The Fellowship's first attempt, therefore, is to bring the doctrine of the Church into a living interpretation of our time so that faith may be evoked. It desires to convert men to Christianity more than to its political beliefs. This attempt, however, is not to be regarded as an alternative to the second aspect of our vocation which is stated in the following section.

(5) In every specific historical period God is transforming, destroying and

---

*For an understanding of the modern theological category **daemonic** see Dr. Paul Tillich's **Interpretation of History**, Part Two, Section I, "The Demonic". Also his article **The Kingdom of God and History** in the Oxford Conference volume by the same name.

affirming special aspects of human historical existence. Our faith leads us to try discern what God is doing in our world and to affirm the purposes of God insofar as we think we see them.

Recognizing the fallibility of all human judgments we do not identify all of our religiously inspired political and social decisions with our Christian faith. We belong to an inclusive Church which has within its fellowship persons of varying political and social convictions. The Church is not held together by common political convictions but by a common faith which meets the human situation at the point where all human political programs find their limit and criticism.

We do not, however, regard the political implementation of our faith as a matter of optional importance. We believe it to be necessary for Christians to band together in common purpose upon the basis of common political and social convictions, dealing with what they believe God demands of them in the concrete situation. Our Fellowship is thus ideally a movement within the Church, expressing particular and debatable convictions about the character of our epoch and the actions which are required for our time. Our faith in God's reign brings us together regularly for the task of interpreting our historical period in terms of God's will, a task which is as continuous and changing as history itself. We have a special understanding of our times in economic, political, social and historical terms as well as religious ones.

II.

As we see it, the increasing faithlessness of the modern world is peculiarly evident in the forms taken by modern capitalism, nationalism and communism. This is not to say that all of the forms of secularism are equally to be condemned but only that the seed of destruction is present within them all.

1. **Capitalism.** The present economic system has played a major causative role in producing the situation from which comes the present war and the internal troubles of the nations. Modern capitalism, by which we mean the economic system of the western nations as developed up to 1930 and not an abstract principle of private property, showed itself unable to maintain general employment, to distribute the products of its mass production and to use the resources of physical nature and the creativity of man for general human welfare. It is the will of God that the fruits of nature and of human creative production be used for the satisfaction of human needs and the development of human culture. Human disobedience has expressed itself in an economic system which subordinates these things completely to the payment of dividends on invested capital. Profit, in the sense of money gained by the investment of money, is the god served first. The **profit-motive** which is a psychological reality is unduly stimulated by such a system but it is the objective profit of the system of which we speak here.

Further, capitalist economy, by its inward logic, has become monopolistic. Great centers of wealth are themselves in slavery to the principle inherent in them: that money must make money, a principle upon which no other human civilization has founded its economic life. The great monopolies are absolutely responsible to the necessity of earning dividends and in the last analysis irresponsible to the will of God, human need, cultural development, world justice and peace, and even national military and naval defense.

Our age has seen the beginning of the senile stage of modern capitalism. When the system is not sustained by state expenditures for social services or armaments, it gives rise to great capital surpluses which cannot find investment, increasing unemployment, under-consumption commonly called over-production, mass poverty, and a strong tendency toward international war for raw materials and exclusively controlled export markets.

The necessity for maintaining human existence is everywhere destroying the present form of our economy. Economic power, for good or ill, is being made to serve other ends than the enhancement of money wealth. This inevitable transformation of our economic system creates the possibility of a new step in human progress as well as the threat of retrogression and casts the whole problem of our future into the sphere of politics.

Since the State alone is potentially strong enough to force responsiblity for general human welfare upon the monopolies of economic power, our destiny is largely to be determined by the struggle for the State which is taking place, or has taken place, in every industrial nation. In this struggle, the Fellowship believes that democracy will survive only if it is able to embody its principles in the economic organization of man's life. Democracy as a political system and social reality must control the economic system through the State in terms of general planning and directly in industrial organizations or the economic system will destroy democracy by the State. In the sense of being committed to a democratically controlled economic system we adopt the symbol, **socialism**, without the acceptance of doctrinaire blueprints for the future which are so often associated with the word.

Our understanding of **socialism** has undergone a progressive modification due to a changing and deepening of our theological convictions, a gradual assimilation of European experience through our emigre members, a close observation of the Soviet development and our experience with the American Communist Party. For most of us the word **socialism** indicates a general direction of democratic transformation of our economic, political and social life, each step of which must be taken in the light of the effort to maintain democratic controls of the State, to avert bureaucracy to the greatest possible degree and to preserve as much freedom and automatism in the marketing of goods as is possible. We are continuously discussing the question of **socialism** as an adequate description of our position but are at an impasse for lack of an alternative label. At the moment **socialism** means to the majority of us a willingness to advocate the intervention of the State in the economic order by various controls, including government ownership and operation where it seems necessary, to the end of substituting the goal of justice which promotes general freedom and welfare for the goal of enhancing the income and wealth of individuals and corporations.

We are deeply aware that a particular form of economic socialism may be achieved at the price of losing democracy in the social and political spheres. Western democracies must create within themselves States powerful enough to curb the tyranny of economic monopolies without creating tyrannical States. Political Fascism may come as the way of achieving economic socialism or as an unsuccessful attempt to avert it. Both as

Christians and as analysts of our times we see **bourgeois democracy** as much more valuable than it is considered to be by any form of Marxism.

In this struggle for a democratic state and society, we believe that organized labor plays a special role which is its vocation under God. This, of course, means only that the vocation of other groups must be informed by this understanding of organized labor. In America the great middle class will determine the issue either by an active alliance with labor which will not prohibit a critical attitude, or by inertia and final acquiescence in domination of the state by reactionaries. The special vocation of organized labor means that it is the only potentially powerful organized body whose enlightened self-interest coincides roughly with the best interests of the majority of men. Labor has a righteousness not its own which calls us into its support. In America, Labor's divisions into several inimical camps (we remember here that the Church is so divided), its general lack of responsibility for racial and unemployed minorities, its failure to educate its members in respect to the political situation, and its lack of political unity, coherence and articulation may make it unable to fulfill its election. Allegiance to Labor does not make us uncritical of it, and criticism of it does not make us unsympathetic with the ills resulting from sin which afflicts all human societies.

The Fellowship believes that the process of change may involve conflict and destruction. We do not believe that good-will alone is a guarantee against the possibility of violent conflict. We do believe that the most certain way of mitigating conflict and violence is to enlist the largest number of the total community in the struggle for a new order. On the basis of our Christian doctrine, we recognize the inevitability of the conflict of interests in society as one of the forms in which human sin will always express itself. We cannot, therefore, share the optimism of Marxists, Communists and Liberals who imagine that a new economic and political system will eliminate all conflicts in the world and solve all the problems of the human spirit.

2. **Nationalism.** The disintegration of medieval culture held together by the Church in which all participated and by a world-view which all shared was followed by an affirmation of human creativity and of the possibility for a good historical existence which took three major forms; capitalist economy and its cultural outlook, democratic politics and its doctrine of the natural rights of man, and national self-consciousness with its conception of the nation's vocation and destiny. While these three developed in alliance with one another and to a certain extent fused, there were contradictions between each element and the other two. National self-consciousness developed in dependence upon capitalist economy and was and is to a certain degree enhanced by it, yet in its extreme development this self-consciousness can overcome and destroy the capitalist system and class, its outlook and its international linkages. Conversely, capitalism ultimately tends to betray the interests of the nation in the interests of maintaining the system and the class in all nations. Democracy, in principle humanist and derived in part from Christianity, has universalist principles of justice, freedom, human brotherhood and equality which are in opposition to the particularism of both nationalism and capitalism. The weakening of the Christian power over human society to-

gether with the development of their inherent principles has given rise to the breakdown of the alliance of these three modern forces. Nazism is the daemonic outbreak of nationalism which under pressure of capitalist decay and rising democratic power overthrows both capitalism and democracy. We should not close our eyes to the fact that its power is derived in part from real weaknesses in its foes and that it has elements of validity in its emphasis on the natural and organic aspects of human life and society against the too rationalistic character of both capitalist and democratic culture. Nazism is a neo-pagan and anti-Christian eternalization of race, nation and soil while Japanese nationalism is a pre-Christian affirmation of these realites as supreme. Both move outwardly from an uncriticized cultural, racial and spatial center toward world domination. This is imperialism with out the acceptance of divine criticism and without human repentance. It has no sense of responsibility to God since it defies itself. It has no conception of a national vocation for universal history or of a national service to mankind whose essential humanity is deeper than its many divisions.

National self-consciousness in Germany thus broke free from the restraints of Christianity and of the Western Natural Law tradition while in Japan a similar nationalism was stimulated and given technical power by contact with the West without having known the Christian and humanist restraints. Both of these daemonic expressions of nationality must be destroyed before the possibility of justice or peace can appear for the modern world. They leave the world the alternatives of war to the annihilation or acquiescence in their domination of the world. The bearers of the western tradition (and this includes the Soviet and China) by reason of their power, their tradition and their will-to-live are called to the task of destroying this religious nationalism and its semi-pagan allies. The true acceptance of our role should mean for the democratic powers an acknowledgment of our guilt in an economic and political imperialism not responsible enough for the just development of the subordinated peoples and in an irresponsible attitude and activity toward world justice, order and peace. Our irresponsibility was born of a strange combination of guilt paralysis which refused to use power or to maintain it to a degree commensurate with our world responsibility and of complacency which enjoyed national privilege with no penetration into the price paid for it by others, the enemies it was creating or the threat which rose to destroy it.

The Fellowship, which numbers among its members some of the outstanding interventionists in America, nevertheless urges that the repentance with which Christians make war should express itself in national commitments as to the nature of the peace. The problem of the organization of the peace is always before us.

All plans which look to the formation of a world state with an international police force seems to us abstract, unreal and impossible of actualization. So also do similar plans for regional states. These ideals seem to us from a Christian point of view to be informed by a too voluntaristic and Pelagian doctrine of man. We believe that the future will be shaped by real national centers of power which exists at the close of the war. Each of these major powers will have by geography and history certain spheres of influence for whose security they alone can be responsible. Only

upon these major powers can there rest real responsibility for the justice, order and peace of the world. These realities can come only from the disinterestedness of the people of the major powers to whatever degree it exists, from the pressure of power centers within each major sphere upon the power to which they look for security, and from the conditional support, criticism and opposition of other major powers.

The political principle which underlies our post-war planning is obvious. It is that justice and order and peace are always secured by a central power and that protection against the tyranny of that power is secured only by a moral ethos and by balances of power within the framework of order guaranteed by the central power. It is to be hoped that in the post-war period, the spheres of guaranteed security will develop into constitutionally qualified commonwealths of peoples which will permit self-determination in terms of language, culture and government while integrating small nations into the major powers' economic systems and military securities.

3. **Communism.**

a. **Marx and Marxism.** The Fellowship owes a deep debt to Marx. His exposure of the nature and self-destroying character of capitalism, his contribution to modern sociology, to the sociology of knowledge and to the interpretation of history have illumined our age for us. Not least are we in debt to his prophetic passion for justice, equality and universal human brotherhood. He was a child of the Old Testament prophets as well as the Renaissance which emerged from a Christian background. We seek to make use of his contributions in all of our theological and historiological thinking. But at no point can we accept Marx without drastic modification and transformation. From the beginning of the Fellowship we have been rigorously critical of orthodox Marxism even as we debated the real meaning of Marx himself. This criticism has been on every level. Religiously we have understood Marxism as Utopian idolatry uninformed by a Christian doctrine of the sinfulness of self and self's group and without a sense of the need for divine redemption. Marxism is nineteenth century liberal thought rendered powerful by prophetic passion and dogmatic by modern self-confidence and rationalism. Sociologically we have criticized Marxist movements because they are entirely machine-informed, rigid in ideology and abstractly intellectualistic in their patterns for human society. And we have sought to interpret history in the light of the previously enunciated doctrine of the Kingdom of God combined with a empirical observation of world forces and their apparent trends rather than in terms of Marxist dialectical materialism. Acknowledgment of our debt to Marxism in no way obligates us to be Marxist.

b. **The Soviet Union.** Despite our criticism of Marxism, we believe that the rise of Marxism and its embodiment in Russia is a judgment upon bourgeois society as the rise of bourgeois capitalism was a judgment upon medieval feudalism. The Soviet has made great gains in the achievement of economic justice, the widespread dessemination of cultural goods and the unification of the Russian people with a common culture, deep loyalty, lasting stamina and great military power. The world can never escape the criticism which Soviet achievement steadily brings to bear upon it. These achievements, however, have come at the cost of a political and economic concentration of power in the State which we seek earnestly to avert for western

democracy. Again, we believe that the Communist ideal as embodied in the Soviet unnecessarily mutilates organic forms of social life by coercing them into mechanical moulds. This is particularly evident in the spheres where earlier Communist ideals have already been partially modified, namely in the Communist attitude to the so-called bourgeois family and in the collectivization of agriculture and the marketing of goods.

In its political relationships with other nations we view the Soviet Union much as we do any other nation with which we are allied in a war for our national and democratic existence. With it we share certain common international objectives and certain common foes. We do not expect of it any great transcendence of national interest despite its original claims to be the incipient realization of the just and logically next and final world order. This interpretation of itself the Soviet has itself withdrawn along with its program for world revolution. The withdrawal is due in part to the necessities for national survival by alliance with democratic nations and in part to the progressive development of nationalism within the Soviet itself. It remains to be seen whether the self-universalization will revive in its dogmatic and messianic form when the security of the Soviet Union is relatively established.

On the other hand we do not single out the Soviet for special condemnation as it pursues its own self-interests. We are aware, of course, that a nation which is not subject to the immediate opinion of its public through politically democratic government is more immediately dangerous in the international sphere than a politically democratic nation. To ignore this fact would be foolish.

III.

Objectives:

1. To increase within the Christian Churches the understanding of the world crisis as it has been outlined above and to provide a fellowship where persons who share those convictions may find mutual help in thought, action and problems of our special vocations.

2. To provide opportunities for discussing our theology and our interpretation of history in close relationship to the changing times of which we are a part, thus attempting to deepen our understanding of the Christian religion and of our world.

3. To attempt from time to time in our corporate gatherings to embody our understanding of Christianity in liturgical worship and to make available to the Churches the best results of these efforts.

4. To encourage our members in a self-discipline involving the careful stewardship of time and resources in the interest of social change: a responsible relationship to the cause of the workers, in terms of membership in or support of trade unions and political parties devoted to our objectives; the exercising of responsibility, by protest, example and other means, toward all forms of racial and religious discriminations, unjust labor conditions and other forms of social injustice; and activities in the interest of international justice and peace.

A BRITISH SYMPOSIUM ON THE FELLOWSHIP STATEMENT

1. INTRODUCTION BY RONALD PRESTON

When Professor Niebuhr suggested I might try to secure some British comments on the draft statement "The Common Convictions of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians" which appeared in the Spring 1943 number of **Christianity and Society,** I was faced with the problem that there is no similar organized group in existence in the British Isles, whose theology is derived fairly directly from the Continental Reformation and whose members make a pretty clear distinction between that theology and the social, economic and political analysis of the contemporary world which has led them to desire a Socialist society as the best expression of what they conceive to be the will of God for our time.

An article in the Fall 1938 number of this magazine, (when it was called **Radical Religion**) by David Paton, outlined the different groups which make up the Christian Social Movement in England. That article is still in the main relevant today. These groups are roughly:

1. Anglican groups going back to the strongly Incarnationalist theology of F. D. Maurice and B. F. Westcott. These have become more and more influenced by the theology and philosophy of the Middle Ages and are occupied with the elaboration of a theoretical "Christian" sociology. They are not in any way Socialist. Verbally revolutionary in their criticisms of capitalism, they generally ride off on some irrelevant social programme such as Social Credit or the idealization of the land and the peasantry.
2. The order of the Church Militant, a very small Anglican body whose prophet was Conrad Noel. It is an ungodly mixture of "high" Anglicanism, anti-Soviet Trotskyism and Rudolf Steiner's Anthroposophy. Characteristically it is frequently rent with dissensions and is pathologically critical of other left groups.
3. The Socialist Christian League which is about 400 strong, is interdenominational and has definite working-class links. Its theology on the whole, is a rather dated "social gospel", and the distinction it makes between a Socialist Commonwealth and the Kingdom of God is far from clear. Its greatest figure is its chairman, the Rev. St. John B. Groser, or Stepney.
4. A new group, C.C.M.C.O., i.e., the Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership, is now in being. This grew out of Sir Richard Acland's "Commonwealth" movement, but it independent. It has about 150 clergy members and is practically Marxist in its political line. Commonwealth itself, while not being specifically religious, yet has a large element of the old liberal theological social gospel about it, and has attracted a number of Christians; e.g., at its annual conference in Manchester

at Easter of last year, nearly half the members were at an early Communion Service on Easter Sunday. It has about 10,000 members. (The Christian Left has ceased to function. Its Christian basis was of the slenderest, and its idealization of Russia such that it could not survive the successive shocks of 1938, 1939 and 1940.)

5. A number of small pacifist community groups on the land, mostly anarchial rather than socialist in social theory.
6. There is a widespread general interest in the social responsibility of Christians. Archbishop Temple himself and the Malvern Conference which he called together, are symptoms of this. So is the activity of the Department of Social Responsibility of the British Council of Churches and the two Reports, "God's Will in our Time" and "The Church faces the Future", presented to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1942 and 1943. Clearly none of these groups, some Christian Socialist, some just Christian Social, correspond to your Fellowship of Socialist Christians.

There remains an ill-defined group of people who share a general move to the right in theology and to the left in politics. Emphases vary; some are more liberal (like myself) some more Barthian; many are subscribers to **Christianity and Society;** many are present or past members of staff of the British Student Christian Movement; many are associated with **The Presbyter** which describes itself as "A journal of confessional and catholic churchmanship", and is a theological monthly which made its public bow as recently as January 1943 and reflects the outlook of a younger group of ministers, Free Church and Church of Scotland, who are influenced by recent Continental theology. In this general group (which, it must be emphasized, has no organic life) are many who are socialist in politics. When Mr. Jenkins says "most younger English theologians would cordially agree with the statement" he is probably referring to these. Would it were true of all! It is here that folk most like the members of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians in U.S.A. are to be found. I have asked three of them to comment on Prof. Mollegen's statement. Daniel Jenkins and Alexander Miller are joint editors of **The Presbyter.** Mr. Jenkins is a Minister of the Congregational Church, has studied at Edinburgh University and Mansfield College, Oxford, is author of "The Nature of Catholicity", and is now Inter-Collegiate Secretary of the British S. C. M. in Birmingham University. Alexander Miller is a minister of the Church of Scotland at present working with George Macleod in the Iona Community. He was formerly General Secretary of the New Zealand S. C. M. (where he was educated) and latterly Minister of John Knox Presbyterian Church in Stepney (the East End of London), where he worked in close touch with Father Groser. Mr. W. G. Symons is a Factory Inspector and a lay Preacher of the Congregational Church. He is a graduate of Oxford and Birmingham Universities, and has been in close touch with the Industrial Work of the British S. C. M., with the Co-operative Movement, and with the Christian News-Letter.

One reason why there is not an explicit comparable Christian socialist group here is that those of us who might run it and be members feel with Mr.

Miller, that such a Christian group is irrelevant **politically**, and therefore we wonder whether the time involved is worth it; our political work should be with **secular** bodies. Again we are not clear how far our task in the Church is explicitly to propagate socialism or whether it is not rather to stimulate the Christian social conscience generally. I wonder what your views are in this matter. I have a feeling that our respective political situations are very different. This resitation becomes more cogent if we tend to regard the main issue (with Mollegen) as that of a **democratic** economic system, rather than socialism, whatever form it may take. There are some authoritarian forms of it which I should be loathe to see.

With these preliminary reflections I must make way for the commentators, with only one further comment. Unlike My Symons and Mr. Miller I sympathize and agree with your attitude to Russia, but with them, I dislike the tone of the theological basis. It seems to me that philosophical theology has run amuck and a straightforward Biblical statement would be far better.

2. COMMENT BY ALEXANDER MILLER

The memorandum offers the opportunity to raise one or two fundamental questions about the place which a fellowship constituted by political agreement can fill in relation to the Church. I think that there is a lack of theological definition in the early paragraphs of the memorandum, and that it has its roots in this failure to clarify the relation to the Church of a Fellowship of Socialist Christians. (Incidentally, in my judgment, the Socialist Christian League in England is in the doldrums because it fails to face this same issue.)

Since a group of socialist Christians is an irrelevant grouping as far as the general political struggle is concerned (assuming that Christians will normally do their work in secular associations, parties and trade unions) its task must lie within the Church, even if not necessarily within the rigid limits of the formal membership of particular Communions. It must therefore concern itself with uncovering and emphasizing tasks and insights which are implicit in the Christian belief and attitude—tasks and insights, that is to say, which should commend themselves to all Christians as springing from their essential Christian commitment. A Fellowship of **Socialist** Christians, therefore, has a raison d'etre if in a particular generation—**our** particular generation—it becomes clear that only by socialist organization can the Divine will for society be carried into effect. That may be so in our day, and we will assume agreement that it **is** so. But the demonstration that it is so must be, so it seems to me, in terms of the "classical Christian faith" (para. 1) so that opposition is challenged to justify itself from the same point of reference.

Here I think the introductory paragraphs are faulty. It seems to me always a precarious undertaking to try to arrive at an authentic Christian testimony by balancing particular historical emphases, rather than by straight Biblical exposition and doctrinal statement. The pit-falls of the method are illustrated in Mollegen's essertion that degenerate Medievalism "produced in the Renaissance historicism, naturalism, etc. . . ."

This is to give altogether too much weight to the power of ideas, apart from the fact that integral Christian doctrine will not be got at by a balance of naturalism and supernaturalism. The Bible has its own non-philosophical categories and its own perspectives. I should prefer therefore to begin such a statement as this in terms such as Mollegen begins to use half-way down page 1. But here again I think that too much weight is given to man's prerogatives in ideas and in worship. "The Kingdom of God is God's sway not man's and is expressed in history to the fullest possible degree only where Christian worship opens society to the Kingdom's transformations." But the Reign of God is expressed in history whether man worships or not. Christian worship is the acknowledgement that this is so, and is not rightly thought of as a means to releasing the power of God.

There is a confusion of terms throughout this Section because the Kingdom of God is not thought of strictly enough in terms of **personal rule.** The recurrent phrase "the Kingdom **expresses** itself . ." has a platonic ring rather than an authentic Biblical sound. All around this section I have the sense of a lack of theological precision, and surely the prime need in a uniting statement of this kind is that it should be trimmed of all but clear slogan-like assertions, each one plainly defined and not left jostling one another like the conceptions in a sentence like:

> "Insomuch as we judge and act, we live in opposition to, participation in and transformation by the Kingdom of God immanent, The Kingdom of Christ, and are Christian citizens and members of Christian political sects."

This reads like a riddle and the last phrase seems to me false. I may be misunderstanding Mollegen, but if I misunderstand him others are likely to.

I think the difficulty arises from the fact that Mollegen is still dealing in philosophical antitheses. The Bible does not talk about "transcendence and immanence" in relation to the Kingdom, but talks of the man of faith who obeys the Rule of God, and so is accepted of God in virtue of his faith, all that he lacks being made up by Christ's perfect obedience. Outside these plainly personal terms there is only a philosophic fog.

On the political analysis of Mollegen's statement I have not much to say. I am assentially in agreement with it. I think it begins to fumble when it deals with Communism. I fancy that like most Christian treatments of Communism, Mollegen is timid about admitting the real human possibilities that open up, once the essential (in terms of the will of God) socialist transformation is carried through. Even political democracy becomes possible given that transformation, and I believe a realistic Christian theology can examine without prejudice how far the 1936 constitution of the U. S. S. R. really implies the reality of political democracy.

3. COMMENT BY W. G. SYMONS

Professor A. T. Mollegen has produced a valuable and thoughtful statement of the convictions guiding the Fellowship of Socialist Christians. Unavoidably, it is a condensed statement, because of the wide scope it covers; and words, with all their associations, have to be used without much explanation. This makes criticism "from across the Atlantic" difficult, for it is hard to distin-

guish between real differences of meaning and mere differences in the use of words.

1) My first doubt arises over the words "secularization" and "secularism". These are "blanket" terms, covering a multitude of sins—and some things which may not be sins at all! Church folk have a habit of using these words as a sort of dirge, in lamentation for the many changes which have resulted in religion, and religious organizations not getting as good a showing as they once did. In more precise terms, "secularization" may be used in one of two distinct ways; either for a change in habit of mind and in philosophical assumptions—the growth or a rigidly "this-worldly" attitude, which has no place for religion in any form; or else it may be used to mean the freeing of parts of social life (education, poor relief, hospitals and so on) from ecclesiastical control. This latter tendency has been, in the main, a good thing. Few would wish to return, for example, to the clerical control of medical science; and it is, therefore, unfortunate to include it in a common condemnation. And, furthermore, is the secularization of **ideas,** even, quite as important as is suggested? Obviously there are differences in the mental atmosphere of different periods; yet it seems true to say that:

"There shall always be the Church
and the world
And the heart of Man
Shivering and fluttering between
them,
Choosing and chosen."

In all periods of the Christian era there have been folk with a varying degree of Christian understanding, and a Church proclaiming (often with an uncertain voice) the judgment of God. At all times, too, there have been injustices, wars and social evils, and there is not much reason for preferring the ages of Faith to those of secularism.

This whole opening section, in fact, seems to involve too "idealistic" an interpretation of history, and to ignore some of the more important insights which we associate with the name of Karl Marx. Do not social organizations and economic factors matter even more than ideas in shaping the course of history? In practical terms, the early development of modern machine production would almost certainly have involved something akin to capitalism whether it happened in a secular or a "believing" setting; and irresponsible capitalism results in injustice whatever beliefs there happen to be lying about. This same point crops up later, when there is a reference to "capitalist economy . . . unguided in a secularist culture". Why **"in a secularist culture"?** Is it seriously suggested that **irresponsible** power can be wielded safely in **any** culture? The verdict of history seems to be that even clerical hierarchies, when possessing irresponsible power, are not immune from the corruption which comes from that irresponsibility; and in economic and civic affairs differences in intellectual belief do little to qualify the facts of power. If "secularism" is the root of the trouble, if it is the "secularist culture" which makes capitalism evil, then religious propaganda (in the narrow sense) is all we need. Capitalism, presumably, can be trusted "in a Christian culture"—or can it?.

There is always a natural tendency for Christians to overestimate the influence of ideas; for the main function of the Church in modern society is apt to be thought of as the purveying of ideas. Hence there is an ecclesiastical producer-interest in trying to maintain the pre-

dominance of ideas among the factors shaping history; it is very tempting to trace our modern evils to neglect of the Church's particular patent medicine. Of course, such a suspicion does not itself **disprove** the thesis which is being advanced, but it gives good reason for caution. Is the primary **cause** of the "crisis of the West" (if that term has a precise meaning) increasing secularism or is it the outcome of modern techniques?

2) The theological statement of the basis of the Fellowship, expressed in terms of "the Kingdom of God" seems somewhat obscure and is put in terms unfamiliar to a British reader; phrases like "openness to the judgment and transformation of the ingressing Kingdom of God" leave a confused mental picture. Perhaps this is because the phrase "the Kingdom of God" has been so misused in Liberal thought that it is commonly avoided in a definitive statement. These truths would, I think, be normally expressed by those in Great Britain whose thought is nearest to "Christianity and Society" in terms of "obedience to the Divine Will". I am not clear whether this is a difference of terminology only, or whether a deeper difference is involved. On the face of it, the form of expression in the Statement seems in danger of being content with an impersonal (or subpersonal) view of God and not to make room for Him as One Who has dealings with men. The Kingdom of God is not a Utopia nor a Legalistic ethic; yet the words used in these affirmations seem only to be escaping such interpretations with a struggle. A doctrinal statement based clearly on God's nature, His will revealed in His redeeming acts and His judgment, would surely be simpler, more adequate to classical Christian belief and less liable to mis-interpretation.

3) The analysis of the present political situation is easier to follow, and raises less fundamental considerations. My main questions here are on matters of emphasis rather than analysis.

To the British reader, the Statement seems to be leaning over backwards in an endeavour not to give away anything to the U. S. S. R. There is not a sign of recognition that the present Russian regime has achieved anything whatever in its internal social life. Apparently the only significance of the Soviet Union is as a military power. Surely it is possible to preserve a critical attitude to Communist Utopianism and to the authoritarian political system of the U. S. S. R., while recognizing that within the U. S. S. R. the great degree of social responsibility of the economic system has allowed real economic and social achievements.

The language and the tone of the statement seems to be intellectualist and middle-class. The intellectualist note shows itself in the over-emphasis already mentioned on idealistic factors in history, and also in a tendency to treat abstractions—e.g., capitalism—as though they were concrete entities, almost persons. ("It (capitalism) served God and mankind only . . ."). The result is an apparent preference for juggling with these abstract terms rather than dealing more precisely with the way in which problems of power and organization emerge in practice in the changing fabric of society.

The statement is middle-class in that, while it talks about power in the abstract, there is little reference to **economic justice.** It may be that the proper control of power is prior to the achievement of justice; and, indeed, justice can never be fully attained. One the less, justice is a fundamental criterion in judging be-

tween economic situations. It is difficult to avoid the suspicion (perhaps unjustified) that the statement is written by and for professional folk, who have no great social power, but who do enjoy a measure of moderate affluence and economic privilege. It is, therefore, easier to condemn irresponsible power than to appreciate the fact of economic privilege and what would be involved in lessening it; hence there is a tendency to soft pedal on God's judgment at this latter point. Coupled with this is the tendency to refer to "Labour" as though it were something strange and external to the Christian Church. There is little sense of real solidarity with working folk on the human plane, or of endeavour to enter into their institutions, but rather a paternalistic attitude which will give intellectual support and "high minded' criticism. This is written, of course, from the perspective of Great Britain, with its very different Labour Movement and its different tactical possibilities; yet I suspect that in the U. S. A., as in Great Britain, the class-entanglements of the Churches and the right attitude to **privilege** are fields of Christian obedience which have social as well as individual significance — more, perhaps, than the "Program" suggests.

4. COMMENT BY DANIEL JENKINS

Professor Mollegen's statement of the common convictions of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians has been read with the greatest interest in this country. The combination of Christian orthodoxy with political radicalism which it represents is not perhaps so rare in England as it appears to be in America, but even from our point of view we recognize it as an important landmark in the history of Christian social thought. A lengthy comment is unnecessary, so most younger English theologians would cordially agree with the statement, but there are one or two places where, in our situation, we should be disposed to put the emphasis differently.

With the substance of your analysis of the capitalist system we are in complete agreement. But we have been made conscious of the reality of the restraints upon the unfettered development of monopolism which can take place under social pressure, even within the structure of capitalist society itself. Many of us, therefore, with the official Labour Party itself, are becoming increasingly suspicious of a doctrinaire socialism which does not cover the complexities of a living society and are beginning to feel our way to what will be that "new and better political creed" which will produce "a more realistic radical democratic politics" of which Dr. Niebuhr spoke in his Spring 1943 editorial. We have to admit, however, that at the moment we are clearer about the theological presuppositions of such a creed than about its practical implications.

Likewise, some of us are beginning to see the truth of Mollegen's assertion that "both as Christians and as analysts of our times, we see bourgeois democracy as much more valuable than it is considered to be by any form of Marxism." Certainly its virtues are less manifest on the economic side than on any other, but it has many political and social achievements of an unspectacular, but solid character to its credit. Its chief vice, and this has been particularly apparent in its theology, has been its infinite self-complacency, but nowadays it

is, after all, producing its own sternest critics. The influence of anti-bourgeois "back to the land" movements, whether semi-feudal or pacifist and "community", is still strong in religious circles, and many of them have a great deal to teach us; but in their justifiable protest against the sins of bourgeois society they are unjust to its achievements, while their own positive theories are often romantic and unpractical. England, the U. S. A. and Holland are still better places to live in than modern Spain or Italy, while most of us would prefer the common life of a North Country industrial village to that of a pacifist community on the land.

We have serious doubts about the statement that "in a way more immediate than any other group, Labour's enlightened self-interest coincides with the best interests of the majority of men". We recognize that that may very well be true of America, and it is of course still broadly true of this country, but there is a growing feeling of concern here, lest there be a combination of the great trade unions and the leaders of monopoly capitalism to their mutual advantage, and at the expense of the public. The time has come when the interests of the consumer need to be emphasized as strongly as those of organized Labour, against those who have control of the means of production. One of the reasons why rationing has been so cordially welcomed has been not merely that it has provided an equal share-out of what goods there are available, but also that it has exercised a measure of control over producers. Many members of the Labour Party would, of course, entirely agree with this and say that public control of the primary means of production would be the only means of ensuring that the rights of the consumer would have their due place, but in view of the influence of the Trade Unions in the councils of the Labour Party, we are unable to take the unambiguous attitude to Labour you seem to hold. Certainly, English Labour needs to be taught self-criticism today, rather than that it has a righteousness not its own.

We agree with what you say about nationalism in relation to war, but like you, many of us have come to see once more that we must not be frightened by the words "nationalism" and "imperialism" from trying to fulfill the immense responsibilities which, whether we like it or not, rest upon our shoulders as a people at the present time. It is true that the temptation to accept our historic mission "without a religious sense of contrition" of which Dr. Diebuhr spoke in his article in "Christianity and Crisis" for 4th October, 1943, is still strong in our midst, but the other temptation of which he spoke, that of being afraid of the perils of that mission and of the ambiguities of "power-politics", is even stronger, especially among younger people. Most of us still suffer from a paralysis of will which is the result of the peculiar modern combination of a bad conscience and the lack of clear standards of judgment. One of our chief needs today, therefore, is the revaluation of our national history and mission in the light of the Gospel. That is a very difficult achievement, especially in time of war, and friendly critics like your own group in America can do much to help us see ourselves aright.

Your criticism of Marxism is in many ways politically, sociologically and economically timely. This powerful system has exercised a tyranny over the thought of many of us which has seriously misled us about many aspects of society. It is particularly important to be vigilant in criticism of its limitations at the present

time, because red lights are constantly being swung before our eyes and many Christians, even in high places, show signs of being dazzled by them. Nevertheless, it can hardly be maintained that the many real insights of permanent value in Marxism have been widely accepted into the Church's thought and life, and a great task of preserving and disseminating them in the face of popular misunderstanding of all kinds remains to be done.

An important difference between us is that you say very little about the place of small local groups in political life, whereas many of us regard them as of great importance. Democracy, as Mr. G. D. H. Cole never tires of reminding us in these days, comes to life first of all in the small local unit, where men can clearly recognize their personal responsibility for their decisions; and one of our main tasks in rebuilding democracy is to recreate a genuine interest in local government. We are very interested in what you say in Objective (3) concerning liturgical worship, but we should be anxious to go a good deal further. In our view there should be the closest link between Liturgy in the widest sense, as the ordered service of God in His Church, and our life as Christians in society, both among ourselves and in the world in general. Experiments among Anglicans with Parish Groups, based on the Parish Communion, and among Congregationalists with the Church Meeting, have been directed to reforging that link. We recognize clearly, however, that all such efforts are vain, unless they carry with them a serious determination to grapple also with the large-scale political forces which dominate the modern world.

Another difference between us is that you say little about the motives which control political action, even though it may be at one or two removes. The discussion of "archetypes and paradigmatic experiences" in our present society, initiated by the work of those associated with the Christian News-Letter, is becoming increasingly important in our midst and carries with it a clearer recognition than ever before of the political significance of the nature of the educational system.

Yet these differences do not affect the broad similarity of outlook between your group and many Christians in this country. It is greatly to be hoped that after the war our contacts with one another will increase. There is much that we can learn from one another's experience, and the kind of mutual criticism and encouragement we could give one another would do much to deliver our Christian social thinking from unconscious national egotism and narrow-mindedness. Such co-operation about issues which concern us all would be one of the most genuine ways in which we can give effect to our common membership of the universal Church.

MR. MOLLEGEN'S REPLY TO THE BRITISH CRITICS

It must be understood that the criticisms to which I am replying refer to the original statement and not to the revision as it is now published. The original document was a conflation of previous statements and of a hasty revision which I made, acted upon by the Fellowship at a meeting when I could not be present. Had I known that the statement would be given international attention, it would not have remained in its obscure and unassembled component parts.

I rather suspect that the revisions which were made at the Fellowship meeting and others which I have made at the request of the meeting, will meet some of the British criticisms. I will therefore try to answer particularly those criticisms which I assume not to have been met in our revision:

The only real point of criticism which hurts lies in the consensus of the three critics that the theology is philosophical and not Biblical. Confessedly I do not understand this criticism which must have validity beyond certain verbal misunderstandings such as I hope to clarify. Let us deal with the latter first in the hope of removing misunderstandings and revealing real agreements. Mr. Miller thinks that "too much weight is given to man's prerogatives in ideas and worship". The first theological statement is cited as an example. Since human ideas are not mentioned there and only worship we shall leave the ideas out. The point is that "the Reign of God is expressed whether man worships or not". Agreed! But lone worship makes the difference between an expression of God's Reign in **an embodiment** of that Reign and an expression against a non-worshipping society which destroys rather than transforms. Worship does not release God's power but it places us within its transforming influence and takes us out of its destroying effects. Granted that God against me means that I must die. But God for me in Christ means that I live beyond my death as a new creature by faith. I do not believe that Mr. Miller means to raise the question of grace and freedom. If so, I retire promptly and ignominiously. Perhaps now we have agreement.

Next and still Mr. Miller, "the Kingdom of God is not thought of strictly in terms of personal rule. The recurrent phrase 'the Kingdom expresses itself. . . .' has a platonic ring rather than an authentic Biblical sound". I do not like Platonic noises and much prefer Biblical tones. But Mr. Miler is tone deaf. "Repent ye for the Kingdom of God is at hand." "The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation", ". . . for the Kingdom of God's sake." These are Biblical and mean the personal rule of God. Why can't "the Kingdom of God expresses itself" mean "the personal rule (reign) of God expresses itself"?

It may comfort Mr. Miller to know that the riddle he quotes is almost a riddle to me and the last phrase false unless the "we" means the membership of the Fellowship which it does. Dr. Niebuhr solved the riddle and translated it for which I am grateful. See the new statement.

And now perhaps the real issue. Mr. Miller writes that "the Bible does not talk about 'transcendence and immanence' in relation to the Kingdom, but talks of the man of faith who obeys the Rule of God, and so is accepted of God in virtue of his faith, all that he lacks being made up by Christ's perfect obedience. Outside these plainly personal terms there is only a philosophical fog." Mr. Miller cannot mean this. The Bible speaks of nations being elect as nations and remnants as remnants. This is personal but not individual. What does faith do to my obedience to God as a citizen of the United States? Does it not lead me to believe that God has a personal will for my nation as a nation, even as the sinful, semi-pagan, half-frightened, half-braggart nation that it is? And is this a philosophical fog or has not a too narrow construction of the Bible raised a fog which obscures part

of the Bible. Is this fog one that emanates from Basle? If so it mixes strangely with the closing paragraph about the Soviet. Maybe I am wrong but I believe that all of the real human possibilities that may open up in the Soviet in all of its future will ultimately rest on the Christian background and ingredients of Western culture and that unrenewed by Christian faith, corporate worship and religious education they will shrivel and disappear. I cannot imagine Marx, Engels, Lenin or Stalin springing out of Buddhism, Confucianism, Platonism, Aristotelianism, Manicheanism or neoplatonism. Neither do I believe that the power of their ideas can last very long nor periodically recrudesce as Christianity does.

And a last word about Mr. Miller. We do not "try to arrive at an authentic Christian testimony by balancing particular historical emphases, rather than straight Biblical exposition and doctrinal statement." There has always been a real question about the content of a straight Biblical exposition and doctrinal statement. Unfortunately, every purely Biblical doctrine has always revealed itself to later Christian generations as an interpretation of the Bible, made consciously or unconsciously in the light of some knowledge of the history of Christian thought and conditioned to a great degree by the historical outlook of the interpreter's world. The Bible as Mr. Miller knows is not a Platonists apprehension of eternal forms but the voice of the living God spoken to a particular people in a particular time. The judgment that the Middle Ages were too otherwordly and the Renaissance in a Christianized culture too this-worldly as no pre-Christian culture ever has been or could be is a judgment made from a point of view not a method of achieving a point of view. This point of view claims to be Biblical but not in the sense of merely returning to the Bible. If we return to the point of view of **Romans**, we are not interested in social justice at all. Where indeed in the whole New Testament is there any interest in changing social structures to achieve a little more material justice for masses of non-Christian men? One has to go backward through the New Testament to the Old Testament for this kind of thing. Calvin knew this in his own way. Biblical thinking will view its world from a New Testament place through a Christian interpretation of the Old Testament and this will always be a creative enterprise, hazardous and to be repeated again and again. But when we do it, we will at least have had a try at taking a modest place within the history of Christian thought and that consciously.

And now Mr. Symons. Secularism is an ambiguous word. It seemed to the Fellowship to imply a straight agreement with the Roman Catholic over-simplication of the Renaissance as the second and by far the worst Fall of man. Secularism means to me simply the closing of human culture to the criticism of the transcendent God. It means loss of the divine human encounter. The Church as an institution can and does become secular—usually by domesticating God, that is, incorporating Him into its earthly domicile.

In the sense of freeing human institutions from ecclesiastical control, secularization seems to me generally good. I spoke only of groups and their institutional life freeing themselves from God's sovereignty.

And now for the chicken-and-egg question, "Do not social organizations and economic factors matter even more than ideas in shaping the course of his-

tory?" If by ideas we mean "Idealism's ideas" the answer is, "yes", with Marx. But Marxism wields the idea that all ideas save Marx's are ideologogy as a powerful weapon for changing history and maintains that the whole history of mankind is to be changed by acceptance of the true idea of history. We see history through ideas and if the ideas do not let us see history truly, then history is made by our failure to understand it. All five of our propositions can be turned into Idealistic ideas by making **history** an abstract idea. But if **history, Society, nature, political and social structures,** etc., remain the concretions that they really are then a true theory takes on its toneness by arising at the point where a given historical period and God meet in the tradition of the Church. **Theoreo** means "I see". Could it not be possible that a theory is something with which we see and we ought to use it only for seeing something? I believe that Tillich's justification by faith epistemology in "Kairos and Logos" in **Interpretation of History** is unsurpassed in modern epistemological discussion. Perhaps it could be said that it is the only answer to the problem of the sociology of knowledge raised by Mannheim in **Ideology and Utopia.**

From this standpoint Capitalism in a profoundly Christian culture would not have been the Capitalism that we know. If it had been a responsible power it would not have had the development it has had. Modern capitalism could not exist in a profoundly Christian culture. But this does not mean that we can transform it simply by making everyone Christian any more than it means that if Luther and the Pope had agreed, they would, with their respective followers have been able to have converted everyone to a profound Christianity. "Why don't people become profoundly Christian?" is a question which always answers itself inside of me.

The Church has the only patent medicine I believe in but there are a lot of other bottles on the same Church shelf and mine looks like the colored water (or poison) to another Churchman. But mine at least has the virtue of not regarding itself as an idea to be purveyed. For some of us dogma is merely a designation of a place where God meets man in Christ and the Church. The place is really almost dark until God appears. Dogma is the set of ideas which assume their true meaning and proportion only when God grasps a faithful community through them. Ideas are not to be purveyed by the Church so that people will believe that they are true but so that God may deal with men within the Christian tradition and therefore as Himself, the Christian God.

As to being intellectualist, middle-class economically privileged and writing to such poor creatures—Guilty! Kyrie eleieson. But is this deducible from regarding capitalism as a concrete entity? A lot of heads have been cracked by it on the picket line and a social structure can disobey God because it is the product of many generations of persons not one. But it isn't good or clear language and I have excised it.

As for real participation in Labor's institutions, I was dropped for being an incipient interventionist in 1938 and am not important enough to be picked up again. I was called an Anglo-phile!

THE WORK OF A CHAPLAIN

By RICHARD DAY

You ask me what a Chaplain does and I gather that you want a rather full length description. All Chaplains are required and expected to do certain things in the Army. Many of these are the same for all—or the only difference being that dictated by the ecclesiastical affiliation of each Chaplain. But there are other things which some Chaplains do and others do not. Some of these things are done because of the Chaplain's personal inclinations, predilections and convictions. Others are those which a Chaplain of one kind of unit does, while such things are not possible or necessary in other units. The greatest dividing line here is that between combat and supply units; but even within the class of combat units there are differences—between, for example, the work of a Chaplain in the air corps and the field artillery, and also between the field artillery and the infantry.

When not in combat all Chaplains hold regular Sunday services. Daily services may or may not be held. The Roman Catholics usually say daily mass. Some Protestant Chaplains conduct week-day services and some do not. Not unlike such services in civilian parishes, they may be held every day or on certain specified days; and they may be Prayer Meetings, Bible Classes, Hymn Services, Holy Communions, etc., depending pretty much on the denominational background of the individual Chaplain. (It should be said in passing that no Chaplain is required to hold open Communion if such action violates his ecclesiastical vows; but if he does not hold open Communion he is responsible for getting another Chaplain who will do so to come to this unit.) Generally speaking, the fundamentalist-revivalist-pietist brethren hold more services than do the others; and, at least in the division to which I belong—which has a great number of men from the hinterlands of the South—the services of these rousing brethren are better attended than the others. Without wishing to be intellectually snobbish, it can be said truthfully and objectively that a great deal of their appeal lies in the fact that not only do they speak vividly of heaven but the idea of God they present to the men is very much of "a cosmic bell-hop", to use Harry Emerson Fosdick's phrase; which is, to say the least, a very comforting thought to have when one is in a tough spot—provided one has taken all the necessary precautions to have Him not only on your side but looking out especially for you.

From the point of view of denominational rigidity, the Army Chaplaincy is a somewhat liberalizing influence. Protestant Chaplains have to minister to all Protestants. Also there must be a certain amount of cooperation between Protestant, Catholic and Jewish Chaplains. This is usually accomplished in a friendly and even in an enthusiastic manner. But rarely does any of this lead to a real meeting of minds between Chaplains who differ greatly in previously held convictions. Scarcely ever are vital issues discussed—or, for that matter, intellectually interesting ones. At best it results in a "live and let live" attitude.

As a rule one Chaplain is assigned to each battalion (composed of about nine hundred men). Since there are three battalions (plus some separate companies) in each regiment, there are three Chaplains in each regiment. Technically speaking all the Chaplains are "Regimental Chaplains"; but in actual practice, the senior is called "The Regimental Chaplain", and the other two are called "The Assistant Regimental Chaplains". (All those in a regiment may be Captains now after six months' service.) Usually there are two Protestants and one Catholic in each regiment. The Catholic has to provide services for all the Catholic men in the regiment while the two Protestants provide services for all the Protestant men. (The senior Chaplain has also to provide for the Jewish men, either by bringing in a Jewish Chaplain or a civilian rabbi, or organizing the services himself.) Almost always where there is a chapel—for the most part, back in the states—the Protestants hold joint services, one Chaplain preaching and the other conducting the rest of the service. The same arrangement often is made in the field; but there are plenty of instances where one Chaplain writhes as the other preaches. Since it has been found that in the field where no chapel is available, services are better attended when they are held for a battalion at a time, it is often mutually satisfactory to the Chaplains for them to hold separate services. Indeed under these conditions it is often necessary, since the battalions may be situated at widely distant points. But it must be said quite emphatically that even when separate services are held because of conflicting convictions, the Chaplains still stick together, present a united front and give mutual support.

All services are usually well attended but none quite so well as those held immediately prior to going into combat. Unless it is utterly impossible a Chaplain will always hold a service, usually the Holy Communion, before his men go into battle. The men attend for both good and bad reasons, of course: there are many who do not want to take any chances. Some, but not all, of this latter group are more interested in magic than in religion. Despite the popularity of the phrase with many Chaplains, there are plenty of atheists in fox-holes—both covert and overt ones. However some men do find a deeper meaining in Christianity when they stand on the edge of eternity. Indeed the Chaplain himself may, nay, must.

Once the unit has been committed to combat it may be impossible to hold any services. (I was unable to hold any last Easter. That was at the beginning of the drive on Bizerte.) Rarely is it possible to hold large services. Services for small groups may be held during lulls in the battle or when they are temporarily not engaged. Since a unit may be strung out over a wide area the Chaplain may have to travel quite far to look out for his men, and on roads open to attack by enemy planes or artillery fire. Sometimes it is necessary to travel several miles on foot. The men are always glad to see the Chaplain—even those who never go to church. They appreciate the fact that he is sharing their dangers and hardships with them.

A Chaplain usually makes regular visits to the hospital where he sees the sick, injured and wounded of his own battalions, regardless of denominational affiliation. If a man in the hospital wants to see any particular Chaplain that is arranged for. There are regularly assigned hospital Chaplains, but when it is possible the unit Chaplains visit their own men. When in the combat zone it

is by no means always possible, since the men may be evacuated to a hospital as much as eight hundred or a thousand miles away (as was the case in North Africa). When possible Chaplains also visit their own men who are in the guardhouse.

During the periods when the unit is not in combat the Chaplain makes pastoral calls of a sort. In a regular camp in the states Chaplains do not customarily roam at large through the company areas. They restrict their visiting to the day rooms, recreation halls and mess halls. But in the field, especially overseas, bivouac areas are open ranges and the peripatetic possibilities are limited only by the Chaplain's ability and willingness to "pick 'em up and put 'em down" —and he had better be able to do that. It is quite acceptable for a Chaplain to meander through the company areas at will and to stop and talk with the men at any time as long as he does not interfere with their training. Chaplains usually go on marches and problems with the men. This not only permits making more contacts but a bond is established between the men and the Chaplain when he shares the hardships of the field with them—marching in the rain, sleeping in the mud, eating cold rations.

Most Chaplains who know anything about the custom in the British Army, envy the British Chaplains their "padre's hour". No doubt a great deal more could be accomplished if our Army would institute the practice. The Chaplains of this division have suggested this to the Commanding General with the proposal that one hour of each week's training schedule be designated as "the padre's hour" and that those men who wish to attend such a session be permitted to do so while the others continue with regular training of some kind. As yet nothing has come of the suggestion.

Of course all Chaplains provide ample opportunity for men who wish to have individual conferences. When in barracks each Chaplain has regular office hours; but such routine is hardly necessary in the field when the Chaplain is living right with the men. Back in the states many men come to see the Chaplain in the hope that he can help them get a transfer or a furlough. Overseas when a man comes to see the Chaplain in almost every instance he wants to talk about religious or moral matters. (In the states it is a universal custom to tell a soldier, especially a recruit, who complains about anything to "go and see the Chaplain". That phrase rapidly loses vogue after the first battle. One does not hear it very much after that except on the lips of a replacement fresh from the states.) Besides religious and moral matters, there are, of course, occasions when a man comes to see the Chaplain because he is having trouble at home. Sometime the case is such that the Chaplain can help by writing a letter—to the local parson or to a member of the man's family, for example. If it is actually a welfare case, he helps the man get in contact with the Red Cross.

According to strict Army regulations a Chaplain is responsible only for the spiritual and moral welfare of the men. He may not be assigned such duty as being Special Services Officer. It sometimes happens that such assignments are made; but the Chaplain is not only permitted but required to record such assignment in his monthly report and the situation is usually rectified very quickly. As part of their designated duty Chaplains give regular sex morality lectures to their men. It is required by regulation that the men be given a series of lectures

on sex every six months. A medical officer speaks on sex hygiene, emphasizing especially the necessity for prophylactic measures. A line officer tells of army regulations concerning men who contact venereal disease, pointing out that a man who contacts a disease and fails to report to the medical officer is subject to severe punishment. The Chaplain speaks on sex from the moral angle—although I have known Chaplains who after making a passing reference to self-respect and fair play, have gone on to paint a vivid picture of the dangers of pregnancy and illegitimate birth and especially the dangers of contracting disease and the horrible consequences that might ensue. Needless to say this is not the Chaplain's job. This aspect of the subject is adequately covered by the medical officer and by the film on sex hygiene which all men have seen during their initial training period. Not many Chaplains emphasize this aspect—certainly very few who have been to Chaplain School. However there is the temptation to follow the lead given by the medical and line officers and place the greatest emphasis on fear.

Even when such an emphasis is not made, as one can see at a glance, this system works at cross purposes with itself. The other two officers direct themselves to the lowest common denominator, whereas obviously the Chaplain can not, or should not, do that. Some Chaplains feel that the attitude of the medical officers especially (which is often simply a matter of saying "Well, if you must then you must, indeed you probably will, but be sure and take prophylactic measures",) undermines so thoroughly what they have to say that they feel that theirs is an almost useless task. But the Army has to deal with all sorts and conditions of men; and most Chaplains realize that whereas there are many men who will indulge themselves regardless of what is said, there are others who do not treat the matter so lightly. However, there is the general feeling among Chaplains that the medical officers present the subject with such moral laxity that men who might otherwise restrain themselves will become lax.

Because of the obvious contradiction between the two approaches to the subject and because of the fact that when the Chaplain immediately follows the medical officer the ground is ill-prepared for the seeds which he wishes to plant, it is generally believed that the system of giving all the lectures at the same time is a bad one. The point was presented by the Chaplains of this division to the Commanding General, and as a result an order has been issued that Chaplains' sex morality lectures shall be given at a separate time. But even this arrangement leaves much to be desired. That is why some Chaplains, especially those who have had some training along this line, are trying to work in at least a slightly broader program than the one now called for. But until the Army itself undertakes the job even those programs are hamstrung. Furthermore, be it said that generally speaking Chaplains should not be assigned to do this job. They are usually no better prepared to speak on this subject than they are to speak on the law of Lorentzian transformations. Many will violently protest when any one who speaks on the subject does not attempt to close every breach in the stone wall of prohibitions.

Some Chaplains—but very few that I know it—try to carry on some sort of an educational program besides the purely religious and moral. This Chaplain has carried on a discussion group for almost a year now. We have discussed all

the stock subjects: the causes of the war, relations with Russia, peace plans, America's foreign and domestic policy, labor's part in the war and after 'led by an A. F. of L. organizer), and also sex. The meetings have never been very well attended; and at times it has been very discouraging. But a few of us have kept on meeting when we were able—even meeting a couple of times on the outer ring of a defense position in the Kasserine Pass, it so happening that one platoon which has furnished the nucleus of the group was out there and the men had to stay near their posts. There has been a pathetic lack of reading material. We have used articles from **The Nation, The New Republic, The Reader's Digest, Christianity and Crisis**, etc., and passed them around as well as possible. But that isn't the only drawback. There are not enough men really interested to keep the meetings going regularly. Sometimes the faithful few can not attend. The men as a whole are not interested. This is in striking contrast to the British Army where a regular educational program is carried on. For the Chaplain who is not content to confine himself to individual pietism this situation is frustrating. Many of the men feel mentally and culturally starved; even many who show no interest in the discussion group. And they often express the wish that the Army would carry on some sort of an educational program. Again, it is up to the Army to sponsor this and work it into the regular program. I understand that steps are being taken to do something along this line. It is only as a Chaplain can work against such a background that he can really bring his Christian weights to bear.

If a Chaplain runs a battalion or regimental library he has a chance to talk with men regarding books and this, although it is only a drop in the bucket as far as the whole cultural level of the Army is concerned, is often encouraging to the Chaplain himself. It is only too true that most of the men limit their reading to mystery stories, tabloid newspapers and comic books, but there are always a few who want to read good literature. It should be added that the libraries are pathetically small, partly because it is impossible for a unit to transport many books and partly because many are not to be had overseas.

The Chaplain's post during battle is usually at the battalion aid station. Sometimes this is only a few hundred yards behind the front lines and is subject to enemy artillery and mortar fire. Of course the site of the aid station is chosen with a view to providing maximum protection; but it is often impossible to find absolute safety. Here at the aid station the Chaplain ministers to the wounded and dying. He will usually combine spiritual with medical ministration, the latter under the direction of the battalion surgeons. He may help bring in the wounded, sometimes going out into areas open to enemy observation and exposed to direct fire. If, as is usually the case, he is designated as Graves Registration Officer he has to take care of the dead; to see that they are all found and properly cared for—either exacuated to a cemetery in the rear or buried in a temporary grave on the battlefield with as fitting a funeral as is possible. It is often difficult, and sometimes dangerous, to find all the bodies and evacuate or bury them. The work must be done in the dead of night, as a rule, with no light whatsoever. The men are always anxious to know that their fallen comrades have been found and taken care of. Again and again soldiers will ask the Chaplain about men who have been kill-

ed, wanting to know not only if they have been found but also if they have been given a Christian burial with proper military honors. Chaplains must also take care of the personal effects of the dead, turning them over to the proper authorities so that they may eventually be sent to the nearest of kin.

Often times during a lull in the battle or during the night the Chaplains will go up to the front lines just to chat with the men and see how they are getting along. If he has candy and cigarettes he distributes them. It is amazing and gratifying to see how much the men like to see their Chaplains come up in this way, even if all he does is say "Hello". It makes the Chaplain feel somewhat ashamed that he is not up there with them all the time, even though that is impossible; but it also makes him glad to do what he can and to know that his presence and what he stands for is truly appreciated.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Paul Lehman is Professor of Religion at Wellesley College.

Richard Day, a member of the Executive Committee of the Fellowship, is now Chaplain of the 1st Battalion, 47th Infantry, and is in Service overseas.

Charles D. Kean, now Rector of an Episcopal Church in Springfield, Mass., has just accepted a call for a Church in St. Louis, Missouri.

A. T. Mollegen is Professor at the Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia.

Ronald Preston, who introduces the others who have contributed to our Symposium on the Fellowship Statement, is a Secretary of the British Student Christian Movement, and also the British editor and representative of "Christianity and Society".

CHRISTIAN FOUNDATIONS OF THE PEACE . . .

By PAUL LEHMANN

When the Second World War comes to a close with the cessation of hostilities, the peace will have begun. Like the war itself, the peace will be an historic experience of critical duration. How long the peace will last will depend upon the foundations on which it rests. And like the nature and the conduct of the war, the foundations of the peace will require the constant distinction and correlation between principle and strategy, on the one hand; and on the other, the total and persistent mobilization of the resources and the energies of human beings around the world.

Now it is possible to desire and to build the peace on other than Christian foundations. It has been done before. And there are many sincere and competent persons around the world whose thinking and whose activities are informed by quite other and quite worthy considerations. Such people are secular in the best sense of the word. They believe that the world in which human beings live is not the property of chance but that it can and must be ordered by responsible human behavior. They know that responsible human behavior is defined by the correlation of individual self-interest and of the self-interest of distinct groups within the social whole, with the equally basic but ever widening and more inclusive interests of the total society of mankind. One could say, I think, that secularism at its best is thinking and living in terms of the active responsibility of men for what goes on in this world. And it seems to me that such secularism is able to deal more significantly with such inescapable and complicated matters as war and peace than those forms of religion which are either unable to affirm or which in principle deny the reality and the importance of life in this world. Such non-historical, or a-historical attitudes and practises are characteristic of ancient polytheisms, and of the great oriental religious traditions, and of the more familiar and obviously psychological cults of the spiritual life which currently and curiously bid for devotees. They offer their own brand of peace, to be sure. But it is a highly individualized offering which is at best irrelevant and at worst irresponsible toward a world which is beginning to emerge with unimaginable travail from a total war.

However, the preference of responsible secularism over against irresponsible religion so far as the coming peace is concerned does not go to the root of the matter. The critical question affecting the peace is not the question whether there are possible and desirable foundations upon which it can be built, and if so, what these foundations are. The critical question affecting the peace is whether there are adequate foundations upon which it can be built, and if so, what these foundations are. I venture to think that there are adequate foundations of the peace and that these foundations are derived from the Christian religion. When the Christian religion is thoughtfully and seriously regarded both as a faith and an order, as a point of view and an institution, as a doctrine

and a church in the world, it will be seen to contain insights and resources for the guidance of a world at war and at peace which promise the fulfillment of the world's desire, namely, the triumph of peace over war.

I make this statement with a full sense of what it involves. I do not forget that the Christian religion as faith and as doctrine has very often during the course of Christian history been taken as an end in itself and led men away from active responsibility for the affairs of the world. I know that doctrine is not life and that faith often placidly and inertly waits for God to do all the work in the world. I do not forget that the Christian religion as an institution has very often during the course of Christian history threatened the advance of culture and aspired to temporal power which have made men afraid of the Church when they no longer respected it and disrespectful of the Church when they no longer feared it. I know that institutional forms which possess the sanction of religion have a way of persisting far beyond their usefulness and that the great peril of institutional religion is clericalism which is only too readily the bulwark of political and social reaction. But I also think that the modern mind has been too much and too long convinced by its proper resentments against the errors of the Christian tradition. It is time to recognize that Christianity also has been affected by the cultural and social changes which have come to such sharp expression in the present war. Indeed, a fundamental re-orientation has been going on since the last war, and even before, (though markedly since then) within Christianity itself. And this re-orientation has sharply altered the interpretation of the Christian faith and the Church's sense of its responsibility for what is happening in the world. It must always be regretted that many thoughtful contemporary people have not found it worth while to explore what has been going on of late within the Christian movement. But the severity of the crisis through which we are passing and the indeterminate future into which we are breathlessly moving have underlined with a fresh urgency the fact that a collegiate or post-graduate comprehension of science, economics, and politics coupled with a third grade comprehension of Christianity is ill-suited to the reconstruction of a world, one-half of which has been largely shaped by the contribution of Christianity to its cultural and political development.

I think it can be said, therefore, that the fundamental re-orientation which has been lately going on within Christianity justifies this attempt to suggest that there are Christian foundations of the peace. What, then, is it that has happened to Christianity which makes these Christian foundations of peace worthy of notice? It seems to me that two major changes have taken place within Christian thought and life which could have and ought to have an important bearing upon the adequacy of the peace. The first is the re-discovery of the fact that the basic articles of the Christian faith contain a profounder understanding of human nature and human history than had been generally supposed and than could be offered by alternative views of human nature and human history. The second major change is the re-affirmation in the context of the contemporary world of the international unity of the Christian Church. Let us look briefly at each of these in turn so that we may understand the sense in which adequate foundations of the peace may be called "christian".

The Christian faith has always affirmed

that the world of nature and of history was the scene of responsible relations between God and men. The core of the idea of creation is that the world is God's, having been made, that is, given its reality by Him, and that because God is the primary reality in the world, the world can never be regarded as an end in itself, nor can it ever be regarded as unreal or unimportant. The world, therefore, does not just go on and on, and nothing can be said to happen in the world without point. Human beings, moreover, have a special position in this kind of a world. This position is defined not primarily by the fact that they have thumbs and can make tools and hence no longer swing from the branches of the trees. It is not defined by the fact that they have language and a higher order of intelligence. These all belong to the structure of the world as it has been created. But the special position of human beings in the world is defined by the fact they can and must respond to the order which God has established and which God maintains by His will for the fulfillment of His purpose. The point of meaning for human life in the world is thus, not the order of nature and not the order of society, but the order of God's purpose which is independent of, though effective in, the order of nature and society. The Christian faith has always affirmed, in the second place, that there is a profound dislocation in the world which God has created. This dislocation is the basic fact about life as it actually is lived in the world and it means that there is a gap between the order of God's purpose and the order of nature and of society. Indeed, human history could be said to be the proof of this cleavage between God's purpose and the order of nature and of society because human history is the story of man's restlessness toward a better order than the one in which he finds himself and because this restlessness is accompanied by ever continuing fears and hopes, ever new securities and insecurities, and by the basic awareness of men that although they are never wholly responsible for the situation in which they find themselves in the world, they can never escape responsibility for it. This is why history is essentially tragic and in need of redemption from beyond itself. History is tragic because it is never possible for men to avoid their responsibilities for and in the situation in which they are without worsening that situation; and it is likewise never possible for men, however responsible they are, completely to make that situation what it ought to be. Unless there could be included within God's purpose, also the purpose to deliver the world from its cleavage and tragedy, history would be an eternal round of pointlessness. But the Christian faith has always affirmed that there is a way of redemption which does not deny the tragic character of history but rather which accepts the tragic character of history by suffering rather than despair. The Christian faith sees the life and death of Jesus of Nazareth as the demonstration in history of the way of redemption through suffering love. Suffering love is the kind of love which persists in the exercise of the responsibilities demanded by every new historical situation even though there is no guarantee that those responsibilities will be fulfilled within history itself.

Now what have these affirmations got to do with the peace? Well, it seems to me that the immediate issue of the peace is whether the anarchic and conflicting interests and demands of the nations which have been engaged in and out-

raged by the war can be restrained and directed so that the minimal conditions of world order on a global basis can be established. Will the understandable thirst for revenge engage the services of justice in a new aggravation of the wounds of the conflict? Will the predatory impulses of the victors exploit the victory and the chaos of the battle-scarred nations for economic and political advantages which power can compel but never in the long run maintain? Will the war weariness of the peoples of the earth drive men anew between the irresponsible cynicism which seeks to satisfy the long denied and fundamental needs of basic human existence in the world without regard to the less compelling but equally fundamental needs for a world community? Or will men take the way of an equally irresponsible idealism which seeks to heal the bitterness and disillusionment of the war by the firm resolution and the fair dream of a world in which the lessons of history have at last demonstrated that force never makes matters better but always and only makes them worse?

These are all perilous possibilities which make nothing so important as the way in which the peace is approached both by those who are charged with the authority for making it and by those who delegate them this authority. I submit that the ways of thinking which have governed responsible people before the war and during it will not be competent to deal with these tremendous perils. So long as men believe that human nature is to be understood primarily as an extension in variety and complexity of the order and structure of sub-human nature; so long as men believe that human beings can by taking sufficiently long and sufficiently inclusive thought about themselves and the world bring into being by slow stages the order of life which they believe to be desirable and good; so long as men believe that history is an open field of indefinite possibilities which, if persistently and responsibly explored, are certain to bring the fruition of men's hopes (as though the possibility of achievement were the real motivation of human responsibility in the world)—so long as men approach the peace in terms like these, they will be unable to secure it against new violations and new disillusionments. And the simple reason is that such approaches to the problem are informed by an overestimation of the possibilities of human nature and human history and by an underestimation of the tenacity of irresponsible power in the world. It cannot be pondered too much, I think, that this global war has swept a world in which men have believed profoundly in human possibility, human goodness, and human progress, with eyes trained more upon nature than upon God. And it is not, I think, a mere coincidence that the social and political anarchy of our time are accompanied by a moral anarchy and a spiritual confusion which leave the peoples which have to make the peace without any basic certainties and without any compelling sense of responsibility in and for a world which is falling apart and has to be rebuilt.

The affirmations of the Christian faith that the world is a responsible order because God has redeemed it by suffering with and for its frustrations would seem to give more adequate ground for human effort and human hope in the direction of an uneasy peace in a shaken and divided world. How else shall the victors be able resolutely to temper the power of conquest by justice and mercy toward the vanquished? How else shall nations take the risk of surrendered

sovereignty for the sake of a community of nations without continual sabotage in the interests of the strong? How else, to take one specific point, shall the United States overrule the forces within the nation which will prefer to harbor our resources for our own people regardless of the rest of the world? Or to take another specific and increasingly aggravated problem before our own country and really also before the world—how else shall the antagonisms between the white man and the black man, between the Gentile and the Jew be held in check? I submit that these problems are beyond human capacities and human imagination at the moment? They can only be dealt with in terms of demands which are imposed upon those responsible for the peace and upon those who delegate this responsibility by a view of the world in some such terms as those defined by the Christian faith.

And this returns us to the second major change which has occurred within Christianity itself during the last quarter century or so. It concerns the re-orientation of the Church's sense of its responsibility for what is happening in the world. The Christian Church is animated at this moment by a firm and growing conviction of its international unity. It calls this conviction, the ecumenical spirit and it means by this the fact that the Church recognizes that across all barriers of creed and class and race and war there is a way of unity and understanding among the peoples of the earth. The latest dramatic expression of this the visit of the Archbishop of York to the reinstated Metropolitan of the Orthodox Church in Russia. Viewed as a single episode, this visit might be regarded as an expression of a political realignment of Great Britain induced by the exigencies of the war. The perspective of history may still so appraise it. But it is also possible to appraise the almost instantaneous contact between the formally restored Christianity in the Soviet Union and the revitalized Christianity under the new spirit in Canterbury against the background of the growing ecumenicity of the Church around the world.

It was in Edinburgh in 1910 that the missionary movement confronted the Churches which had been sending out the missionaries with the shame and the impotence of a divided Christendom. With a speed that is remarkable when compared with the previous lethargy, a series of gatherings has accurred between the first and second world wars which has brought together representatives of the Christian Church from many denominations and many nations. In Stockholm (1925) and Lausanne (1925), in Oxford (1937) and in Edinburgh (1937), these representatives have met to face frankly the agreements and the disagreements which animate the Church both as regards its faith and order and its life and work in the world. Perhaps the best proof of the new spirit at work in the Church is the fact that without any concealment of the differences that obtain within it, it has nevertheless been possible for the Church to set forth a thoroughgoing statement of the nature and the relevance of the Christian faith in and for a world that has been overtaken by political, economic, and cultural anarchy. In Utrecht, in 1938, almost on the eve of the outbreak of the second world war, a Provisional Committee of a World Council of Churches came into being which points the way toward a continuing development of the ecumenical mind of the Church when hostilities are over.

Machinery has a way of arousing those

who have had a share in its design and operation to enthusiasms which exceed the bounds of sober possibilities. Thus one hears talk at times about the potential effect of the World Council of Churches upon the counsels of the peace or about the misfortune of the Council's having come into being too late to retard the outbreak of the war. But these dreams are happily confined to those who have not yet fully grasped the revised understanding of Christianity that has already been described. The really significant aspect of the ecumenical movement in the contemporary Church is that it has both been a product of and a channel for this revised understanding of Christianity. It is the new sense for the historic affirmations of the Christian faith which has given fresh meaning and power to the Church's place and function in the world as the body of Christ. And it is this renewed sense of the body of Christ that has enabled the Church to subdue the fanaticisms of war and to transcend the lines of battle in a ministry of understanding and of healing that promises to outlast the spiritual and material devastation of the conflict. Political enmity has not destroyed the fellowship of believers in the heat of battle or the agony of the concentration camp or the perilous life of the underground. It is no accident that the Church has risen with power against the tide of anti-semitism wherever that issue has become bitterly acute. There is a new mind and a new spirit at work in the Christian Church which can underline by practice as well as by precept the indispensable conditions of the peace.

The probability is that the peace will not be based upon Christian foundations. This is because the forces making for the disintegration of modern culture do not yet seem to have exhausted themselves and because the course of history is never easily conformed to the insights of the gospel concerning it. But an ecumenical Church with an ecumenical faith has the promise of light in the darkness of a new disillusionment because it knows that "as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, and giveth seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth," saith the Lord. it shall accomplish that which I please, "It shall not return unto me void, but and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." (Isaiah 55: 10. 11)

BOOK REVIEWS . . .

MAN, THE MEASURE, by Rich Kahler, 640 pp, index, bibliography, Pantheon Press, $5.00.

As case material for a dynamic newer humanism, Erich Kahler has written an encyclopedic review of the history of the human race and of the evolution of human culture. His book might be described as a kind of psychoanalytic study of mankind, both diagnosis and prognosis—an attempt to account for the grave cultural malady of civilization today in such a way as to point toward a brighter tomorrow.

Kahler's "psychoanalysis" of mankind results in the discovery that contemporary culture is suffering from a form of paranoia "Instead of the impossible world revolution, something else, that had been preparing for a long time, developed: The world itself, its material conditions, its psychic, moral and intellectual foundations, had grown into a gigantic revolutionary turmoil, the convulsive movements of which had swelled beyond the mastery of man. The revolution had passed from the will of man to objective events. Man is no more the subject, he has become the object of the revolution".

In developing his case history, Kahler has undertaken a review of the background and etiology of civilization in such a way as to substantiate the pessimism of a Spengler, but he does not come out that way. Rather, the combination of his rigorously realistic critical insight and his own personal attitude culminate in the kind of humanistic mysticism best typified by the French poet-aviator, Antoine de St. Exupery, from whose works texts are taken for chapter headings. The result is a somewhat baffling philosophy of history.

There is every evidence that Kahler is led by his research to feel the cumulative effect of the problem of history. He shows this over and over again. But inasmuch as he has no appreciation of redemption and still cannot accept as ultimately conclusive the pessimistic trend of his evidence, he is forced into a double position which is peculiarly unconvincing. On the one hand, he develops a super-cycle theory of civilization, which is not without some warrant, yet which cannot do full justice to the problem he sees and describes. And on the other hand, he breaks completely through both his awareness of the cumulative problem of history and also the super-cycle by means of his humanistic mysticism. The result is that this volume ends with an appeal to the human spirit which does not seem to be completely articulated with the rest of the text.

Kahler is one of the first historians of admittedly humanist bias to discover the illusion of progress—the pitfall into which most humanists tumble. He sees that history, which involves change, does not involve progress, and that evolution exists as a non-moral category. Within the greater framework of evolution, man lives differentiated from the animal world by the qualities of "existence"—awareness of himself as distinct from the world around him; history—seeing his existence in distinct but real relation to the life of humanity as a whole; and "humanity"—a conscious recognition of the parallel existence of others, which forms the basis of love and fellowship.

These three qualities form a transcendence of man over his environment; but he has lost in the modern age the meaning of transcendence. The social milieu

which swallowed up the transcendental capacities of primitive man in an atmosphere of complete unconscious participation in the totality of life around him has caught up with modern man and swallows up his transcendental capacities likewise. This is Kahler's super-cycle. From the life of the primitive tribe to the attitude of the disciples of Ernst Juenger, whom Kahler comments on and quotes at length, evolution has taken place, but the full circle has been turned. "Service to the machine has taken the place of religious services or of service to an idea. For them, 'technics and ethics become, in a curious way, synonomous'. We see by their deeds in Europe what such a human type means; only such a human type can perpetrate atrocities of such mathematical exactitude."

Kahler traces the etiology of the cultural crisis by describing the emancipation of the human spirit through successive stages in each of which the newer freedom is accompanied by the greater problem. "World religion", for instance, gave man the concept of "humanity" and "true individuality" but left him isolated, naked and unprotected. The separation of the spiritual and secular world during the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the Reformation freed man's mind for the later developments of science, industry and mental research but left the secular world disunited and anarchic while making the spiritual world irrelevant. The inevitable evolution of the collective—the deliberate association of men in governments, industries and societies—in an economic and technical age has tended to resume once more, although this time on a secular basis, the absolute dominance of the individual by his environment.

Because of his world-view Kahler sees Nazism as a symptom of the total world malady rather than as the malady itself. Juenger's philosophy is the particularly German expression of a universal ailment. Kahler, like many German refugees, is self-consciously German and sees in the German evolution both the antagonist to and the microcosm of the rest of the western world. Germany, because of the cultural unpreparedness of the invaders of the Roman empire to assume the Christian and Roman heritage, except where it had a native vitality, evolved in scattered fashion, producing both the original capitalist society in the independent inland commercial city such as Augsburg, and the original "state"—political power as an end in itself—in Prussia. Kahler has an almost psychopathic preoccupation with things German.

As an historian of civilivation, Kahler knows the important relationship between religion and culture, but his appreciation of religion lacks depth. The same weakness which is indicated in his leap from cultural pessimism to humanistic mysticism and which is also shown in his inadequate exploration of the concept of existence, is also exhibited by his treatment of the history of Christianity. The bibliography notwithstanding, he presents but a poor restatement of the 50-year old theories of Harnack. Much as Kahler may know about "Christianism", there is no indication that he has any comprehension of the Gospel of redemption, whether expressed in experience, in theology or in the symbolism of worship, although he tries to analyze all three fields.

In his consideration of the evolution of modern political economy, his continental bias leads him to errors of omission and commission. He neglects entirely the contribution of John Locke and the real genius of "The Glorious Revolu-

tion of 1688"; he gives one small paragraph to the preconstitution backgrounds of American culture; and he fails to appreciate any distinctions between the English Whigs and the French Physiocrats, which for a student of American history means putting Hamilton and Jefferson in the same league.

When these and other gaps in scholarship are accounted for, and the author's abstract faith is appreciated for what it is, Kahler's study remains a most useful and well-organized appreciation of world history from the cultural standpoint. Anyone who tries to do what he did is always in danger of biting off more than he can chew.

Charles D. Kean.

* *

HOW TO THINK ABOUT WAR AND PEACE, by Mortimer Adler, Simon and Schuster, $2.50.

There are many good things in this neo-Thomist approach to the international problem but on the whole it illustrates the excessive rationalism of neo-Thomistism to politics. The main burden of the argument is that only a universal sovereignty over all nations can guarantee world peace. Mr. Adler does not expect the establishment of a world state for another 400 years but he warns our generation that nothing less will suffice and he is convinced that we will finally erect such a state when all other makeshifts, such as alliances and federations fail. It is more likely that if a universal sovereignty should ever develop, it will arise on the foundations of some makeshift which has partially succeeded rather than failed.

Mr. Adler does not discuss the problem at all how nations could be brought to accept such and authority over them. The reason he does not discuss this problem is because he conceives the whole issue in curiously rationalistic terms. He thinks that after mankind has discovered that all other means fail it will finally nerve itself to take this ultimate step of creating a universal state. His whole discussion obscures the non-rational factors at work in the political order. He assumes that states create a common community and fails to do justice to the factors of geographic limitation, ethnic homogeneity, common language and common experience, in the formation of such communities. He therefore regards the creation of community as primarily a political, and secondarily as a moral and rational achievement. In this way the tremendous difference between a national community, rooted in some common history and culture and an international community, requiring unity despite the heterogeneity of culture, environment and economic circumstance, is obscured.

R. N.

* *

THE GREAT TRANSFORMATION, by Karl Polanyi, Farrar and Rinehart, $3.00.

The writings of Polanyi ought to have a special interest to readers of this journal because Polanyi, an Austrian economist, has been for years one of the guiding spirits of a Christian socialist group, gathered about John MacMurray, Irene Grant and Polanyi. His interpretation of the total meaning of our western history is a little curious and arbitrary. He thinks that there are "three constitutive facts in the consciousness of western man: the knowledge of death, the knowledge of freedom and the knowledge of society". The first was revealed in the "Old Testament story". The second was

revealed "through the discovery of the person in the teaching of Jesus as recorded in the New Eestament." The third revelation "reached us through living in an industrial society". This is a perversely inadequate explanation of either Old or New Testament religion or the meaning of modern industrial society. Modern industrial society has confronted us with the task of creating a community within the conditions of a technical age. But up to the present moment the bourgeois culture of an industrial society did not give us the knowledge of community; rather it destroyed such knowledge as existed in the Hebraic-Christian culture and in the culture of all agrarian ages for that matter.

Dr. Polanyi is too inadequate a philosopher of history to merit our attention. But he is first of all an economist. Insofar as this book traces the breakdown of a "free market" economy and reveals to what degree fascism is the consequence of this breakdown, he throws some interesting light upon our era. Particularly illuminating is his proof that fascism can not be explained by ancillary causes which may be found in German or Italian character or history. It is a more universal phenomenon than usually assumed. Even the defeat or victory of nations does not cause it.

Dr. Polanyi rightly regards one universal aspect of the fascist revolution as particularly significant. That is that it is always a "fake" revolution instituted by, or progressing through the connivance of the powers that be, because they can find no other escape from the breakdown of the free market, which will maintain their own rights and privileges. This analysis is therefore particularly valuable in revealing the perils of fascism which all nations must yet face, if they have not previously faced them, whether they be Anglo-Saxon or German, whether they be victors or vanquished.

R. N.

* *

MEN AND COAL, by McAlister Coleman. New York, 1943, Farrar and Rinehart. $3.00.

"Men and Coal" is a book which goes straight from the heart to the heart. Our debates these days deal with the lives and deaths of classes, states, peoples, continents; here we have a book about living beings, their aspirations and frustrations, their emotions, their humility, and their natural dignity. They are workers of a particularly picturesque and proud profession. Their story, written by one who has lived with them in all parts of the country for two decades, must be the delight and pride of every socialist. Not that the miners, or their John L. Lewis, of the C.I.O. which grew up around him and them, are socialists; but they are stirringly human, and spontaneous. They are worth serving to the best of our ability. From this book we learn to understand the devoted loyalty of the miners to their union and its leaders, even though they are jealously critical and independent in all matters pertaining to life beyond the pale of their union. The author writes their story, an often thrilling story, as a brilliant reporter and a very fair and impartial observer, from whom one gets plenty of shrewd information. It is a superb book.

Eduard Heimann.

* *

ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE, by Arthur Koestler, Macmillan, $2.00.

There has been much speculation in the past 15 years about whether a "social radical" is a neurotic. Those who wish to ignore his uncomfortable political and

economic theories find considerable comfort in accounting for them in Freudian terms. Some label any conviction or emotional drive as immature if its objectives are the changing of the status quo. Some who are social liberals well to the right of the Left are sufficiently appreciative of the forces of revolution in our society to rejoice in the contribution of this neurotic, if such he be.

Still others seek no explanation in pathology for the singleness of purpose and devotion to justice of the liberal be he right or left, feeling rather that reason without emotion is never the explanation of needed and inevitable forces of change and good.

To the theologian this issue is a familiar one. To the person schooled in the Hebrew spirit and Biblical faith, rationalism offers an insufficient explanation of the potent acts of mankind. The Christian knows that whatever else religion is, it is devotion. The religious spirit is characterized by wholeness of giving. Even poor religions have that in common with great religions that there is a core of committment which transcends reason or the logical explanation.

Creeds follow rather than precede vital experience. Codification, explanation, rationalization, are essential but they are not synonomous with motive nor do they change attitudes or overcome prejudices. Since the psychoanalytic era dawned, theologians have reckoned with the danger that the adjustment sometimes claimed for the outcome of psychoanalysis may result in a vacuum wherein no power is left—no courage is possible, no thrust toward the new and the good can happen. Of course, the theologian finds ample agreement with this aspect of his thought in the theory and the practice of psychiatry at its best. The understanding of both the psychiatrist and the theologian about the re-birth experience as basic to new life and the re-creation of the individual needs no defense in 1944.

Arthur Koestler has several claims to greatness. Not only can he write but he has a cause and has suffered for it. He is no aesthete dabbling with theories in artistic language.

The point of the story told in Arrival and Departure is to be found on pages 167 to 178 of the brief and absorbing tale. His analysis of Sonia Bargar, a psychiatrist who befriended him when he was starving had made the psychiatric explanation of his loyalty in the revolution, clear to him. Dr. Balgar, a skillful technician in her profession, had this to say about revolutionists:

> "I am sick of all their talk about the Future. It is a drug; people who become addicted to it don't live. The point is to make the present antarkic, with protective tariffs all around. Peter tried to explain to her that she was talking nonsense. She was peeling a banana and looked at him across the table. 'Look, Petrya,' she said . . . 'there is more reality in this mouthful of fruit than in the whole future'."

His analytic experience under her direction at a time in his life when a love crisis brought him face to face with his deep neurosis gave him the scientific explanation of all he was and had done. He had been taken back to his infancy and seen the reasons for his behavior, even under the lash of the Gestapo. Almost he was persuaded to her view about the present and the future. He seemed to be utterly irrational if he did not.

Further events in the story bring him face to face with himself not as Dr. Balgar revealed him but as he really was. This was what he said to himself as he turned away from the life of security open

to him, back to the struggle with Nazism and all its terrors—not the obvious struggle of the uninitiated who fights a war against Hitler because he is drafted to an army but the profound struggle of the initiate who knows the difference between freedom and tyranny.

"What would Sonia say to it" (his new decision). . . . Oh he knew what she would have said. She would have talked of the filial quest for the vanquished image of his father, the craving for devotion, shirking of responsibilities, escape. . . . Oh yes, he knew all about that, he was a fool no longer —but how could she explain that in spite of this knowledge he submitted? Yes, Sonia was right but all her logic could not interfere with this experience of supreme peace which seemed to emanate from a source beyond her reach, from the very core of his self. She could prove that all his reasons were wrong; but perhaps in these spheres, the right thing had always to be done for the wrong reasons. And if she called this neurotic, let her."

Later Peter states his problem in terms of seeing the difference between devotion to a cause without knowing the reasons and devotion when he knew them but understood that reasons do not matter so much.

"They are the shell around the core; and the core remains untouchable beyond the reach of cause and effect."

Koestler's most illuminating illustration is that of a meaningless puzzle of red and blue lines—meaningless until you looked at it thru either red or blue tissue paper. Then you see a clown in a circus putting a trained dog thru a hoop or a roaring lion chasing the clown across the ring.

"You can do the same thing with every mortal, living or dead. You can look at him thru Sonia's tissue paper and write a biography of Napoleon in terms of his pituitary glands . . . the fact that he incidentally conquered Europe will appear as a mere symptom of the activities of these two tiny lobes, the size of a pea. You can explain the message of the Prophets as epileptical foam and the Sistine Madonna as the projection of an incestuous dream.

The method is correct and the picture in itself is complete. But beware of the arrogant error of believing that it is the only one. The picture you get thru the blue tissue paper is no less true and complete. The clown and the lion are both there interwoven in the same pattern."

Mr. Koestler is not dealing with religion. But he refutes the theory that science can explain the innermost secrets of a soul's devotion and moral commitment.

Winnifred Wygal.